Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BT 1101 .M27 1883
McIlvaine, J. H. 1815-1897.
The wisdom of Holy Scriptur

Shelf....

THE

WISDOM OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

WITH REFERENCE TO SCEPTICAL OBJECTIONS

BY

J H McILVAINE

THIS ANCIENT AND VENERABLE RECORD CONTAINS THE PROFOUNDEST AND LOFTIEST WISDOM AND PRESENTS THOSE RESULTS TO WHICH ALL PHILOSOPHY MUST AT LAST RETURN

FICHTE

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1883

COPYRIGHT BY
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1883

PHILADELPHIA
GRANT, FAIRES & RODGERS

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON
REC. SEP 1883
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY

CONTENTS

I

THE CREATION OF THE WORLD 1

II

THE MOSAIC COSMOGONY 27

III

THE CREATION OF MAN 55

IV

THE DUPLEX NATURE OF MAN IN THE IMAGE OF GOD 87

V

THE TEMPTATION IN THE GARDEN OF EDEN 99

VI

THE ORIGINAL SIN 113

VII

THE TEMPTER 131

VIII

FIG-LEAVES 142

IX

THE JUDGMENT UPON WOMAN 155

X

THE JUDGMENT UPON MAN 166

XI

The Clothing with Skins 182

XII

The Expulsion from Paradise 208

XIII

The Holy Sabbath 236

XIV

The Institution and Organization of Society 267

XV

Population 300

XVI

The Moral Difficulties of the Old Testament 328

XVII

The Paramount Character of the Lord's Teaching . . . 369

XVIII

Creeds and Confessions 409

XIX

Religion and Politics 447

THE

WISDOM OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

WITH REFERENCE TO SCEPTICAL OBJECTIONS

V

THE WISDOM

OF

HOLY SCRIPTURE

I

THE CREATION OF THE WORLD

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.

THE account of the creation in the first chapter of the Bible has always been greatly admired for its sublimity and beauty. The sentence with which it commences, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," is a grand rhetorical synthesis which brings the whole subject under a single view of the mind, and the subsequent analysis unrolls the vast picture in a succession of the most vivid and animated scenes. Hence we find that even a heathen rhetorician and philosopher, the amiable and accomplished Longinus, could not withhold from it his meed of glowing praise; for in his celebrated treatise on *The Sublime* he speaks of it in comparison with the beauties of Homer as follows: "So also the Jewish lawgiver, who was no common man, exhibits the power of the Deity in a manner worthy of its excellency: God said—what does He say? 'Let there be light,' and it was: 'Let the earth be,' and it was." In fact, the sublimity of this representation of the power of God, in that He created all things by a word, is probably unrivalled in the literature of the world.

The expression, "In the beginning," carries the mind back through all the dim ages of the past in order to portray to the imagination the genesis or origin of all created things. Its indefiniteness is eminently suitable to the subject. For here there is no attempt to determine chronologically when the creation took place; nor, indeed, is there in the subsequent Scriptures any information from which it is possible to form a satisfactory estimate of the age of the world. We have no science of chronology revealed from heaven, any more than of other things which are the legitimate subjects of scientific investigation. There is no reason to think that the apostles or writers of the New Testament regarded the Scriptures as containing an inspired chronology. For they quote from the Septuagint translation as freely as from the original, notwithstanding this version of the Old Testament would give for the age of the world nearly fifteen hundred years more than can be gathered from the Hebrew text. They do not even notice this, nor similar discrepancies, which seems to warrant the inference that they did not regard them as of any practical importance.

It is true, indeed, that learned men have taken the greatest pains to work up a sacred chronology from the data supplied in the Holy Scriptures. But no two of them agree in their results, so that they are of no authority. Nor can this be a matter of surprise to any one who will take the trouble to examine for himself the materials out of which these elaborate systems are constructed; for he will find them to be nothing else but the genealogies interspersed here and there in the historical records, which a child may see were never intended and are totally untrustworthy for any such purpose. For they freely apply the terms, father and son, to grandfathers and grandsons, and even to remote ancestors and descendants; and they leave out, or skip over two, three, and sometimes as many as thirty or forty generations at a time. Thus in the first

words of St. Matthew's Gospel "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham," there are thirty-eight or forty generations omitted, links in the chain which are elsewhere supplied, and how many more we have no means of determining. Now, if this statement stood alone, it would appear that Christ was the son and not a remote descendant of David, and so of David with respect to Abraham. Hence, it would seem that the attempt to construct a chronology out of such materials is preposterous; and that great and good men should have wasted so much labor, learning and ingenuity in building up these imaginary schemes is one of those things which must be classed with the many attempts which have been made, and which have not yet ceased, to discover or invent a perpetual motion. The Holy Scriptures leave science perfectly free within her own sphere, as in all other things, so in this, to determine by her own methods, if she can, the age of the world and the length of time during which it has been inhabited by man. They teach nothing opposed to any conclusions upon these and similar questions which may be established on scientific evidence. If it should thus be proved that the earth is millions of years old, and that it has been inhabited by man for a much longer time than has commonly been supposed, we may accept these results without the least detriment to our faith and with entire satisfaction.

The stupendous theme here presented to our contemplation is the creation of the universe by the power of God at some unknown time in the ages of the past. The being or existence of God is boldly assumed, without attempting to prove or account for it in any way; and in this respect there is a striking contrast between the Christian Scriptures and other ancient books which pretend to Divine inspiration. For in these counterfeits of the true coin we often find the most labored attempts to trace the genealogies of the gods, which are always absurd, inasmuch as it is mani-

festly impossible to conceive of an origin for that from which all other things originated. We cannot even make an effort to form such a conception without involving ourselves in the labyrinths of an infinite series, in which there is always something beyond what we can reach with our minds, and of whose existence no rational account can be given. Instead of leading us into the mazes of this inextricable perplexity, the sacred writers begin with God in the exercise of all His personal and creative attributes, and simply refer to the creation of the world as being in itself such evidence of His eternal power and Godhead that none but the fool can say in his heart, there is no God. And the reasonableness of this assumption can be denied by none but atheists, who are shut up to one or the other of the following alternatives, namely, either that the world has always existed, or that it came into being of itself. Now, that it has always existed and is eternal, is certainly a possible conception, yet it is one which has been constantly rejected by the masses of mankind and by the greatest minds and noblest characters the world has ever seen. With these we joyfully cast in our lot, without undertaking further to refute this form of atheism. But the other alternative, that the universe came into being of itself, is not a possible conception, however it may be regarded as such by minds incapable of profound and rigorous thought. For it is a first and necessary truth that whatever begins to be must be produced by some cause adequate and exterior to itself. All science rests on this truth as its foundation and chief corner-stone; without it there can be no such thing as science or knowledge. But after all, it is probable that nothing better can be said on this abstruse subject than what has been said by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which do appear."

Now this stupendous exercise of the power of God must

be conceived of as truly and properly of a miraculous character, which affords us a favorable opportunity here to examine this primary fact of creation in its bearing upon the vexed question of the probability of miracles in the subsequent history of the world. We propose, therefore, in what follows to contemplate the subject of miracles from the point of view of the primal miracle of the creation of the universe. This we shall find to be high vantage-ground; for scepticism or faith with respect to such abnormal manifestations of Divine power turns very much upon our stand-point. Considering only the absolute uniformity of physical laws, we must regard miracles as altogether improbable, and the burden of their proof as resting on their defenders. But standing where we are placed at the opening of God's revelation to man, on this first and greatest of all miracles, we shall see that the antecedent probability is in favor of their subsequent occurrence, and that the burden of proof consequently rests on those who maintain that they have never occurred. For miracles must be expected in the subsequent history of a world, or system of things, which originated in a miracle.

In the first place, then, that the creation of the world was a miracle in the only true and proper sense of the word becomes evident as soon as we have formed a clear and right conception of what a miracle is, such as is contained in the following definition: A miracle is an act or work of God in the external world which cannot be comprehended under the law of uniformity in physical causation, and to which the power of created beings is inadequate. But in referring such manifestations to the power of God exclusively we neither affirm nor deny that inferior and even wicked spirits may produce results having all the appearance of miracles, for our present purpose does not require the discussion of this curious question. A miracle as here defined can be wrought by none other but the power of God acting in a manner extraneous to the laws of nature.

Yet does it in no wise imply their abolition, violation, or suspension for one moment. Even in the raising of the dead to life, the laws of gravitation, chemical, capillary and electrical attraction and repulsion, polarity of light, correlation and conservation of forces, together with all other physical laws which have ever been discovered or named, retain their uniformity, and remain absolutely unaffected. Let any one who speaks of a miracle as a violation or suspension of nature's laws be required to name the particular law which is supposed to be thus affected, and he will immediately see that no such thing is implied in the greatest miracle that was ever wrought. But a true miracle cannot be ranged under any physical law, nor ascribed to any physical cause, whether light, heat, electricity, chemical attraction, or any other of the forces which operate uniformly in nature. Any fact which may have been called miraculous, if it be attributed to any of these, or if it be supposed that it may hereafter be accounted for by some as yet undiscovered physical force or law, ceases thereby to be regarded as a miracle.

Hence it is obvious that the proper distinction between miracles and natural phenomena does not turn upon the conception of a different power or cause in the two cases. The ultimate cause which produces them is here conceived of as the same in both. Its mode of operation only is different, being uniform in the one, and non-uniform or abnormal in the other. For the forces of nature are simply the uniform action or energy of the power or will of God, and all physical phenomena are the results of His immediate and voluntary agency. But this conception requires to be elucidated and verified.

Either, then, the forces of nature are the energy of the Divine will, or they are the acts of inferior spirits, or they are the properties of matter, or they are entities in themselves. For no other conception of them ever has been, or ever can be formed; nor, indeed, are all those possible con-

ceptions. For as entities in themselves they are absolutely inconceivable, notwithstanding many scientists are accustomed to speak of "matter and force" as if these were independent and co-ordinate existences. It is impossible to form a conception of force otherwise than as the act or property of some being or substance from which it proceeds. In some such being, therefore, the forces of nature must inhere. As the properties of matter they are conceivable, but that this is not the true conception of them may be evinced by many considerations, especially by this, that it is inconsistent with the property of inertia, or essential passivity of matter, upon which all astronomical and other physical science depends. For if a body cannot move itself, how can it by its own power move other bodies? Hence it was maintained by Sir Isaac Newton that the attraction of gravitation, so called, could not be a property of matter, but must be conceived of as a force acting from without upon matter. Moreover, our original conception of that which we call force is derived solely, as all agree, from the consciousness of our own voluntary acts in moving our hands, feet, or other members of our bodies. But for this consciousness of our own voluntary causality we could know nothing whatever of force or causation, and in all the on-goings of the universe we should see nothing but precedence and sequence, or the bare succession of phenomena. Hence this conception of force, so obtained, cannot legitimately be extended to anything which is incapable of volition, for such an extension takes it out of the sphere in which alone we can know that there is any such thing. There is no evidence whatever that original causality can be exerted by any but voluntary beings: in other words, all force is will-power. Hence it becomes necessary to ascribe the forces of nature to spiritual agency, either to that of God himself, or to that of created spirits, angels or demons. This latter view with respect to angels or demons was held by Proclus and the eclectic philosophers of an-

cient times, perhaps also by their great master, Plato himself, and it is favorably regarded by some eminent modern theologians. But it seems to be extremely fanciful, and altogether inconsistent with the precision and absolute uniformity, but above all, with the unity and infinite power which these forces everywhere manifest. The only possible conception of them which remains is, that they are the uniform action or energy of the Divine will ; and this view is held and strenuously maintained by many eminent physicists of modern times. We shall see in the sequel that it is altogether Scriptural.

Now with this conception of physical force it appears that the phenomena of light, heat, electricity, gravitation, and the like, the germination and growth of plants and animal bodies—in a word, all the productions of nature, differ from miracles, not at all in the power which produces them, but simply and solely in that they are comprehended under the law of uniformity in causation. For every such phenomenon there is an antecedent uniform cause, which is always the same for the same effect. Thus gravitation is the one such cause for the falling of a body to the earth wherever it occurs. Hence there is absolute uniformity in all the operations of nature—this is their specific character. In fact, the only true and proper meaning of the word nature is that in which it designates uniformity in the phenomena of the world.

Here, also, we have a criterion of distinction between true and false or pretended miracles. For these latter are phenomena which in reality are produced by uniform or physical causation, but which men ascribe to non-uniform or spiritual agency, either because they themselves are deceived, or because they seek to impose upon others. For whenever anything occurs of which the true cause is unknown, it may be ascribed to some occult physical force, or it may be regarded as a miracle. The former is characteristic of science, the latter of superstition. The Scriptu-

ralview is the golden mean between these two extremes; namely, that there are such things as miracles, but that nothing is to be received as such except phenomena for which natural causes are undiscoverable and rationally inconceivable.

These views may be still further illustrated and confirmed by considering the historical relations between science and superstition. For it is the specific function of science to account for and explain the phenomena of nature by ranging them under the laws of uniform causation; superstition, on the other hand, consists in ascribing them to spiritual agency. Consequently and in fact, wherever superstition has prevailed, science has been feeble; and as science has made progress, superstition has declined. Hence, in the earliest ages, the people were, and wherever the light of science has not penetrated they still are, under the dominion of gloomy and cruel superstitions. The negro population of the west coast of Africa are said to be diminishing in numbers from the enormous destruction of human life, which is constantly going on by the poison-ordeal for the detection of witchcraft. For this form of superstition seems to be the only religion of the people, and every case of natural sickness and death is attributed to supernatural agency. Even among the ancient Israelites, with all their light of Divine revelation, the worship of the golden calf was with difficulty suppressed, and was subsequently restored by Jeroboam, "who made Israel to sin;" whilst "Moloch, horrid king," to whom they offered up their infant children, continued to be worshipped down to a late period in their history. These and other similar abominations of superstition long remained among them, all resting on false miracles. Among the Greeks and other pagan peoples, in the earlier stages of their history, almost every natural phenomenon was ascribed to supernatural agency—was regarded as a miracle. Hence that rabble of false gods which were the objects of

their superstitious worship—gods of the earth, air and ocean—gods of the sun, moon and stars—gods of the day and of the night—a god for every season, stream and tree, and for every passion of the human heart. But when science began to make progress among them, when the uniform causes of natural phenomena began to be discovered, the gods retired, either into the secret recesses of the temples, or to the summits of the highest mountains. If, then, you would find one you must go to Delphi or to some other sacred fane, or you must ascend the steeps of Mount Olympus or Mount Ida. And when it was discovered that uniform causes, the same as in the populous plains and along the fertile banks of the rivers and streams, were in full operation on the mountain tops, the gods took flight to the skies, and dwelt in their golden palaces above the firmament. Even there they were not allowed to rest, but were warred upon by the earth-born Titans. In this final conflict, however, these enemies were overthrown and made to pay the penalty of their crimes. Such earth-born Titans are the great materialists of modern science, who would banish the Creator from the world He has created and upholds by the word of His power, and who may read their doom in this old heathen prophecy.

Notwithstanding, we can well afford to be patient with these painful negations into which foolish scientists are betrayed by their excess of zeal for uniformity, especially when we consider the inestimable benefits of science in every department of human life, but most of all, whatever foolish theologians may think, in religion. For true religion and true science are twin-sisters, both from God, though in different ways; both grand sources of human well-being; and their reciprocal influence is such that neither can do without the other. For, on the one hand, the intellectual faculties of man are rooted, so to speak, in his moral and spiritual nature, by means of which they draw their richest and only adequate nourishment from

the infinite of truth; and it is only thus, in distinction from those of mere animals, that they are rendered capable of growth and development from generation to generation, and from age to age. All science, properly so called, grasps with the intellect the raw material of truth, and subjects it to the forms and laws of thought. It is truly and properly a blossom and fruit of faith, nor can it ever attain to its utmost and permanent development except upon the soil of religion. On the other hand, scientific culture is the most powerful and effective means of developing and purifying the intellect, so that it becomes capable of appreciating the evidences and blessings of true religion, in distinction from baleful superstitions. This, doubtless, is the reason why Christianity, with its transcendent claims upon the faith of mankind, always prevails wherever science is cultivated, and why there is not even a possibility of any other religion in the bosom of modern civilization.

The benign influence of science upon religion, however, is most conspicuous, as has been indicated, in that it emancipates the human mind from the paralyzing terrors and hideous cruelties of superstition. For unenlightened faith does not teach men to discriminate between true and false miracles; nor, in any other respect, between true and false religions. Consequently it cannot effectually guard mankind against, nay, it betrays them and leaves them a prey to superstition. For, inasmuch as it mightily stimulates the imagination, it predisposes the mind to accept as miraculous facts or phenomena which can be otherwise comprehended and explained. There is abundant evidence on this point in the idolatries of the ancient Israelites, in the superstitions of mediæval and modern Romanism, and in those which still remain in the bosom of the Protestant church. The overthrow of superstition is to be ascribed chiefly to the influence of science, stimulated, quickened and developed by the universal diffusion of the Holy Scrip-

tures; and this result is accomplished by its discoveries of physical causes for those phenomena which otherwise are sure to be regarded as miraculous.

Having thus defined and elucidated the nature of a miracle as an act or work of God which is not in uniformity with the course of nature, we easily see that the creation of the world was truly and properly a miraculous exercise of Divine power. For "in the beginning" there was no pre-existing course of nature in uniformity with which the creation could stand; consequently there was no physical cause in operation by which it can be explained. If we admit that the world was created, the supposition of any such physical cause involves a palpable contradiction, because it assumes that nature, which is the system of uniform causation, existed before it began to exist. Nor does it matter how far back in time this creative work of God may be placed, whether six thousand or six millions of years ago, nor how different that which was originally created may have been from what the world is now. It may even be conceded here, what on mere scientific evidence can be strenuously denied, that all existing things have been evolved, by uninterrupted uniform causation, from the elemental star-dust of the astronomers, yet that star-dust, if it was the first thing created, must have originated without a physical cause, that is to say, by a miraculous act of the Creator.

If then, we admit that there ever was any creation at all, if matter be not eternal, although no other miracle had ever occurred in the history of the world, yet here in its origin we have one at least, and one that covers a great deal of ground. And this miraculous origin of the world pours a flood of light upon the question, whether the occurrence of miracles in its subsequent history is, or is not, a credible and probable thing. In fact, it raises a strong presumption against absolute uniformity in the operations of Divine power, and in favor of a very differ-

ent procedure. For since, as in this case, God has once acted in a manner not in uniformity with anything in the past, such exercise of His power is thereby established as one of the modes in which it is competent for Him to act; since He has wrought one miracle He may have seen it equally wise and good to work others; and since that one miracle was the creation of the world, it is reasonable to expect that subsequent development and history will partake, in some degree at least, of the miraculous character of their origin. Thus we see that the antecedent probability, or presumption, is not against miracles, as is commonly supposed, but strongly in their favor.

But in order to estimate this presumption at anything like its full value, it is necessary to take into consideration here the old and well-known truth, that the natures of things are in their beginnings. The peculiar nature of the oak is in the acorn, and so of all other plants after their kinds. The nature of the lion is in the lion's cub, and so of all other species of animals. The nature of man was in the first man, and so of all other created beings. Moreover, the peculiar natures of things often stand out unveiled more conspicuously in their origin than in any subsequent stage of their development or history. We have a beautiful example of this in the young of some domesticated animals, which bear the precise and uniform marks of their former wild state, although these marks have long ago disappeared from their ancestors under the modifying influences of domestication. This principle, that the natures of things are most conspicuous in their beginnings, has been applied in science with magnificent results. Hence that flood of light which the lamented Agassiz, by his studies in embryology, poured upon the physical constitution of man, upon the whole subject of natural history, and, it may be added, upon the fundamental truths of religion. For his work on *Classification* is incomparably the greatest argument in natural theology the world has ever seen. Paley, in

comparison, is as the watch which one carries in his pocket to the world of living creatures.

The principle holds equally good in all historical developments. With what admirable insight St. Paul, in his discourse to the Athenians in the hall of the Areopagus, characterizes Greek idolatry by the germinal principle in which it originated, and in the development and realization of which its life consisted, namely, that the gods were like men, and therefore could be worthily represented and worshipped under human forms and images of gold and silver and stone "graven by art and man's device!" Thus, also, the idea that might makes right is one upon which heathen Rome was founded, in consequence of which it dominated through all her vast history, from the rape of the Sabine virgins to her final conquest and plunder of the world. In like manner, the history of the Jews—what is it to this hour but the realization of the covenant made with Abraham, in which it had its mysterious origin? And what is the history of Protestantism but that of the progressive realization of those ideas of individual liberty and personal responsibility in which it originated? Nor is it possible to comprehend the history of the American republic apart from the ideas, purposes, aspirations and character of those refugees from civil and religious oppression who first landed on our shores and founded our institutions.

Now this truth, that the beginnings of things contain and manifest their true natures, of which their whole history is the development and realization, applies with all its significance to the creation and subsequent history of the world. For since the world originated in a stupendous miracle, the miraculous exercise of Divine power must be conceived of as entering into its constitution, as required for its conservation, and as certain to be manifested in its history. Would it not be a strange and incomprehensible thing if its most essential and striking characteristic in its

origin should from that moment and forever disappear? Is it reasonable to suppose that, owing its very existence to a miracle, it would never in the whole course of its subsequent history manifest anything of a miraculous nature? We might as well say that although the nature of the oak is in the acorn, yet the nature of the acorn is not in the oak. Jewish history originated in the covenant with Abraham, but the principle of that transaction must not be expected ever again to manifest itself in the life of the Jewish people. Greek idolatry sprang from the belief that the gods were like men, but it must not be anticipated that it will ever produce a statue of any god in a human form. Protestantism originated in the principle of individual liberty and responsibility, but it is against all probability that there should ever be another manifestation of this principle in Protestant history. Such is the preposterous assumption of those who admit a primal creation, and yet maintain that the occurrence of miracles in the subsequent history of the world is against all probability, and incapable of being substantiated without such an array of evidence as is required for no other class of facts.

But it may be objected to this argument that it proves too much, namely, that the whole history of the world should partake of a miraculous character. For since the principle in which Protestantism originated reappears at every step of its progress, the miraculous exercise of Divine power which gave birth to the universe ought, not occasionally, but constantly to manifest itself. Now this is a perfectly fair objection, and requires to be as fairly met. The solution of the difficulty, however, is not far to seek, for we shall find it in the conception of miracle which has been defined, together with a further confirmation of this definition.

For the definition of a miracle which has been given includes, along with others, these two distinct and separable elements, namely, (1) an act of God, and (2) such an ex-

ertion of His power as cannot be comprehended under the law of uniformity in physical causation. Now, if the whole agency of God in nature had been of a non-uniform character, it is evident, since all the physical forces are the energy of His power, that there could have been no such thing as law or order in the universe. Consequently science, which, properly defined, is the knowledge of laws, would have been impossible. Neither could there have been any rational creatures; for reason in man involves the recognition of uniformity in such laws as that fire will burn, and water will drown; that food nourishes, and poison kills. It is insanity to think that there is no such uniformity: nor can it be doubted but that, if the uniform laws which now govern the forces and phenomena of nature should be set aside, universal insanity in mankind would immediately ensue. Moreover, without such uniformity the creation itself could never have passed beyond the first stage of chaos, if it could have attained even to that; for law and order are its fundamental ideas as a cosmos, apart from which it could never have existed. In fine, it is an inconceivable thing that the whole agency of God in nature should be of a non-uniform character; for if it had been such, this would have been the uniform mode of His operations. The supposition, therefore, is self-contradictory and absurd. Thus we see that there were the best of reasons why the universe was made subject to law, why a departure from uniformity in all its phenomena was impossible, and why this element of miracle must necessarily be of comparatively rare occurrence.

But, with respect to the other element of miracle, the energy or action of the Divine power, the case is altogether different; for this is always and everywhere present throughout the universe. One form of its manifestation is in the sustentation of created things. For God did not only create, but 'He upholds all things by the word of His power, and by Him all things consist.' The continuance

in existence of that which He has created depends upon the direct and immediate action of His will as truly as did the creation itself. But for this the universe would instantly cease and become as if it had never been. This rock-ribbed earth with all its marble bones, however solid and indestructible it may seem, would lose its solidity; it would melt and dissolve as a vapor, and not even a vapor would be left. This glorious arch of the heavens, this "firmament," whose name in all languages is significant of its immovable stability, would immediately disappear. What stability in these laws of nature, by which the planets revolve in their prescribed orbits, by which the sun rises and sets in his appointed times, by which the earth brings forth her productions in their proper seasons! What conservation of all the forces of nature, so that, in the multiform changes which are constantly taking place, not one particle of them is ever expended or lost! Yet, if God should cease for one moment to exert His energy in nature, that moment all this would cease to be. And this subtle, impalpable essence in man, his mind, soul, spirit, by which he thinks, feels and acts, is no less dependent upon uninterrupted sustentation by the will and power of God than is his physical organism.

But the presence and energy of Divine power in nature is not limited to sustentation. For inasmuch as the physical forces which act upon matter and produce most of its phenomena are the uniform action of the will of God, He is the doer of whatsoever is done by them as truly and immediately as in miracles themselves. God is the immediate source of all working power in and throughout the physical universe. The laws of nature are nothing but the uniform modes or methods according to which, for good and sufficient reasons, He chooses to work. These laws are never to be confounded with the forces of which they are simply the modes of operation; nor are these forces to be identified with the properties of matter, the

chief of which is inertia or passivity. The conception of nature as a vast and complex machine, having its powers in itself as the properties of matter, or otherwise, which God created a great while ago, and which He now stands by, or afar off, to watch and direct, as an engineer superintends the machinery of a factory, would, if it were exhaustively analyzed, be found as self-contradictory as that of a perpetual motion. But the moral consequences of its prevalence are those which are most to be deplored. For if the machine be a perfect one, as surely the work of infinite wisdom and power ought to be, what need or place is there for God even as an engineer? Thus by this conception the Creator is banished from His own works. The omnipotent and ever-active God of the Scriptures becomes little more than the deity of the ancient Epicureans, withdrawn into some remote corner of infinite space, too far off to concern himself with our petty interests or welfare—a god of eternal idleness. Indeed, if He were ever so much concerned for our well-being and happiness, what, according to this conception of Him, could He do for us, even in our utmost need, subject as we are to the fatal forces of nature, with whose operations He has nothing whatever to do? Such views of God and nature render the faith of prayer and all expectation of help from Him impossible and absurd. It is a doctrine of despair.

The sacred writers know nothing of nature as a system of matter and force, nor of forces inherent in matter. They everywhere represent natural phenomena as immediately caused by the power or will of God. In these days there has been a wide departure, even among Christians and theologians, from the forms of expression in which His omnipresent agency is revealed and emphasized. For where we are accustomed to say, it thunders, it lightens, it rains, it storms, and the like, in the word of God it is: "The fire of God . . . God thundereth marvellously with His voice . . . He commandeth and raiseth up the stormy wind . . . He

maketh the storm a calm, so that the waves thereof be still . . . He sendeth the springs into valleys . . . He watereth the hills . . . He giveth rain upon the earth . . . These wait all upon thee that thou mayest give them their meat in due season . . . Thou sendest forth thy breath —they are created. Thou openest thy hand—they are filled with good. Thou takest away their breath—they die and return to their dust . . . Behold the fowls of the air . . . your heavenly Father feedeth them . . . Consider the lilies of the field . . . Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these . . . If God so clothe the grass of the field . . . how much more shall he clothe you ? . . . Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing ? . . . and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father."

Such is ever the Scriptural representation of nature, namely, as the power or will of God working according to those methods which are properly called physical laws. He, therefore, moves the planets, according to the method or law of gravitation, through their vast elliptical orbits around their focal suns. He shines in the light, and quickens the earth with His genial influences. He sprouts the germ in the ground, and draws up the juices of the earth through its capillary tubes, and nourishes therewith the growing plant. He stretches out its branches, puts forth its leaves, blooms its flowers, paints their petals with His own varied and beautiful colors, and forms and ripens its delicious fruit. The lightning is the flash of His eye, the thunder is His voice, now as of old. He speaks in the roar of the cataract, the storm, and the troubled ocean as truly (though in a different manner) as He spoke from the midst of the cloud and flame on the summit of Mount Sinai to the many thousands of Israel. In the motions of the planetary worlds, in the blooming of the flowers, in the growing and ripening of the corn, in the fall of the sparrow, in the birth of an infant, His direct and immediate agency is manifested as truly (though in a different man-

ner) as it was in the creation of the world and in the raising of Lazarus from the dead. All this He does now by His free choice and voluntary action, though in a uniform manner, no less than He so acted when he created the universe. For within, under, behind — or howsoever it may be expressed—all the methods, processes, forces and laws of nature is ever the omnipresent action or energy of the one only living and true God.

And not only in the phenomena of nature, strictly so called, is this ubiquitous action of the Divine power, but also in the sustentation and government of his rational and voluntary creatures, even in the fullest exercise of their own freedom and responsibility. For although man's acts are his own, and in no such sense the acts of God as that thereby his responsibility can be impaired, yet is he not, even in the freest exercise of his faculties, independent of God, but is ever subject to His influence and under His control: "The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord, and as the rivers of water He turneth it whithersoever He will. . . . Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee, and the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain." Thus it is that by His sovereign control and direction of man's faculties God is in all human history working out His wise and holy and benign purposes, no less, (though in a different manner) than in the world of nature, or the sphere of physical forces and their laws. In fine, the direct and immediate agency of God by His Holy Spirit is manifested in the regeneration and sanctification of human souls, and in all the phenomena of spiritual life, in such wise that this whole work would have to be regarded as miraculous in the full sense of the word, if it were not that in it the human is inseparably blended with the Divine, and that it partakes of something approaching to uniformity.

Now, with these Scriptural views of the Divine agency in nature and in man—views which are held by many and an ever-increasing number of distinguished physicists at

the present time—we see that one element of miracle, namely, the energy of God, is in full manifestation everywhere in the universe and throughout its whole history. The other element, that is, departure from uniformity, was not possible nor conceivable, except in rare cases. Hence the objection that, if the true nature and constitution of the world be represented in the miracle of its creation, its whole history ought to be miraculous, is not valid; whilst, at the same time, it is found to embody one of the most important of all truths, and one which confirms instead of invalidating the presumption that miracles in the full sense of the word would occur, whereby a still heavier burden of proof is laid upon those who maintain that never since the creation has there been any such manifestation of Divine power.

Moreover, the counter-presumption of absolute uniformity upon which over-zealous and one-sided scientists lay so much stress, is wholly gratuitous, and no less inconsistent with the most exalted and perfect ideas which we can form of the Divine Being. For there is not a shadow of proof that by such uniformity the best possible results in the government and history of the world could be attained. God, in the exercise of His infinite wisdom and all-comprehending foreknowledge, may, for aught that appears, have the best of reasons for varying His methods of procedure. One such reason may here be suggested, namely, that occasional departures from strict uniformity would be the most striking and conclusive evidence conceivable of His free personality. And there is manifestly great need of just such evidence; for that which is afforded by the uniformity of His operations in nature is incomplete and obscure—at least, there are many whom it fails to convince. Hence it is that those scientists who deny the possibility or the fact of miracles gravitate, as by inevitable necessity, towards either materialism or pantheism, and, in either case, to the denial of the personality of the First Cause, whilst this neither is

nor ever can be doubted by those who admit the fact or the possibility of miraculous phenomena. Also, it is evident that the conception of the First Cause as a free moral and personal Being is a nobler and more exalted idea of Him than that which represents Him—we ought rather to say, it, as an impersonal and fatal force; for a person is higher in the scale of being than a thing—a man is a nobler being than a steam-engine. The truth is, that absolute reason, which is the principle of uniformity in the Divine operations, and absolute free-will or personality, without which no variation from such uniformity is conceivable, are both equally essential to the noblest idea which we can form of the Creator, to whom, as the work of His hands, we are bound in reason to ascribe all that we can conceive of excellence and perfection. What, then, is more to be anticipated than that He should reveal to us the sovereign perfection of His reason, wisdom and foreknowledge of all contingencies by the uniformity of His operations in nature, and by miracles, the fulness of His free personality?

The conclusion which we have kept steadily in view in all the previous discussion, and indicated from time to time, is, that antecedently to all inductive evidence on the subject, it is more probable that miracles have occurred in the history of the world than that they have not, and, consequently, the phenomena which claim to be such require no more or better evidence to substantiate them than other facts for which no such claim is made. Hence the burden of proof does not rest on those who advocate miracles, but on those who maintain that they are impossible, or that they never have occurred, just as it would rest on him who should maintain that there never have been any such things as earthquakes or tornadoes. For the evidence which has produced the common belief of mankind in tornadoes, earthquakes and miracles must stand good until it is overthrown. Whether, indeed, the facts which have been called miraculous are truly such, is always an open

question, until it has been finally decided by science, whether or not they can be accounted for by natural causes, or referred to uniform laws. If in this way they can be rationally explained, they must cease to be regarded as miracles, and remanded to the domain of natural phenomena, whatever may be the consequences. But to deny the facts themselves, or to require stronger evidence for them than for other facts, whilst the antecedent probability stands, as we here see, in favor of occasional non-uniform manifestations of Divine power, is unscientific and preposterous.

It does not enter into the object of this discussion even to touch upon that vast array of inductive evidence which has been marshalled by theologians in defence of the miracles of Scripture, especially for those wrought by our Lord Jesus Christ. All that is here attempted is to show that they are in perfect harmony with the miraculous creation of the world, with the most rational *a priori* conceptions we can form of what its history would be, and with our noblest ideas of the character and perfections of God. There is no room for doubt, however, but that they are inseparable from, and are a chief corner-stone of Christian religion. Whoever denies them, especially the resurrection of Christ, or supposes that they may hereafter be explained by some as yet undiscovered law of physical causation, denies Christ, and must inevitably, if he be sufficiently strong in logic, become either a materialist or a pantheist. Stop short of this he cannot, except by rejecting the legitimate consequences of his own principles—by halting in those very processes of thought which have led him to his present position. This argument, therefore, may fitly close with some suggestions of the enormous difficulties under which they labor who hold that the forces of nature are originally inherent in matter, and that from the uniform operation of these forces the existence of all things can be rationally explained.

First, then, these materialists can give no account whatever of the origin or existence of matter as endowed with these properties or powers. Whence did it come? How came it to be thus mysteriously and wonderfully endowed? They do not pretend to answer these legitimate questions, but, with a frankness which is worthy of all praise, they say, We do not know. How much easier is it to believe in God as the Creator of matter, and as the primary source of all the natural forces! But, in this case, the stupendous miracle of creation comes back upon us, along with all its consequences, as these have been exhibited. Secondly, they have no rational account to give of those innumerable correlations and adaptations in the cosmos which evince intelligence, purpose, design, as clearly and fully as it is conceivable that these could be manifested; for, if intelligence had presided over the formation of the world, how could it have been made to appear otherwise than by just such correlations as we everywhere see? The physical, intellectual and moral correspondences between the two sexes, the mother's bosom and the nourishment of her child, the stomach and its food, the heart and its blood, the lungs and the air, the eye and the light, the motions and order of the planetary and stellar worlds, the light and heat of the sun in their relation to the production, support and development of organic life, the intellectual faculties and their objects—all these, together with innumerable similar correlations and adaptations, result, if we are to believe the materialist or pantheist, whether avowed or veiled under development theories, from the operation of blind unintelligent causes, the forces of nature which are the properties of matter. How much easier is it to believe in a God of infinite wisdom, power and goodness, who created all these things in their beautiful and perfect adaptations to the purposes which they subserve! In the third place, the human soul, with all its wonderful powers or faculties of intellect, sensibility and will, is pro-

duced, according to science run mad, by the operation of the same forces or properties of matter, which themselves have no will, no sensibility, no intelligence. Is not this an effect without any adequate cause? Is the maxim that "the quality of the effect is antecedently in its cause," which has always been regarded as a necessary truth, and which lies at the foundation of all science and knowledge, no longer a truth? Can that which has no intelligence, no sensibility, and no will, be the cause of sensibility, intelligence and will? How much easier is it to believe in God who created man in his own image! Finally, these men affirm that Christ and his apostles were either fanatics and fools, or impostors; that He himself never rose from the dead; that His mind and soul have utterly perished, and are as if they had never been. *Credat Judæus Apella, non ego.* And, again, how much easier is it to believe in God who raised up Jesus Christ from the dead!

In the leisure of a summer vacation it happened that the author once read over almost consecutively Renan's *Vie de Jesus.* He was quite carried away for the time by the magic of its sensuous style. When he had finished the work, he took up the Gospels, and read for an hour or two, and he here bears record that it was like coming up out of the sulphurous darkness of hell into the clear light and vital air of heaven. Again he sat at the feet of Jesus on the shore of the sea of Galilee. Peter and James and John were there, and Mary Magdalene, and Mary, the ever-blessed mother of the Lord. Once more he looked up with them into that dear face, and there beheld the wisdom, power and love of God revealed. There, also, in the face of Jesus Christ, he saw that his own soul was immortal, and that it was an object of the Divine compassion and love. Ah, how the tears flowed as he heard his Lord say, with what voice! "O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?" Then it was as if he had stood on the banks of the river of life, which flows forth out of the

throne of God and the Lamb through the golden streets of the new Jerusalem, under the shade of the tree of life, which bears twelve manner of fruits, and yields her fruit every month, and whose leaves are for the healing of the nations. And there he resolved that, God helping him, he for one would go down into hell no more.

II

THE MOSAIC COSMOGONY

These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens.

THE cosmogony of Moses has been often attacked and defended with arguments which seem alike unsound, and the controversy is yet undecided. Here, therefore, it is in place for us to examine the principal questions to which it has given rise, in order to see whether any further light can be thrown upon it. The subject, however, is a very extensive one, involving, as it does, the relation between science and religion in general, which requires to be elucidated before we can reach any right understanding of the cosmogony itself. Properly understood, however, nearly or quite all its alleged difficulties may be expected to disappear.

It is quite evident, then, that the scepticism of modern times finds its strongest defences and support in the notion which, no doubt, is sincerely held by many, that the teachings of Divine revelation are somehow inconsistent and irreconcilable with the best ascertained results of physical science. Hence there has arisen a schism between science and religion which is productive of very deplorable consequences. Yet we may be sure that these twin-sisters cannot remain forever at feud. There must be some common ground where reasonable people can stand without prejudice against either, and with their minds equally open to both of these grand sources of truth and human well-being. Indeed, it seems plain from the past history and present state of this controversy that it could never have

arisen unless either scientists or theologians had transcended their own legitimate department of knowledge and invaded the province or domain of the others. As a matter of fact, this error is justly chargeable on both parties, inasmuch as science is constantly presuming to question and even to deny the truths of religion, and religion, the truths of science. A thousand examples on either side might easily be given, such as the assumption—for, as we have seen, it is no more—by many scientists of absolute uniformity in all the operations of Divine power, so that miracles and answers to prayer become impossible, and, on the part of theologians, such interpretations of Scripture as are inconsistent with the most certain truths of science. We may be sure, therefore, that this baleful schism can never be healed until religion and science shall come to recognise each other as original and independent sources of truth, and as ultimate authorities, each within its own sphere. But this of itself would not give us a final solution of the problem, for the results accepted as truths on both sides might still be inconsistent. It is necessary, in addition, that a principle of interpretation be established which, consistently applied to the whole Scripture, shall leave no legitimate ground for science to deny the truths of revelation, nor for religion to call in question the truths of science. Such a principle we here undertake to establish, not, indeed, as anything new, but only as requiring a more rigorous verification and a more extensive application than it has hitherto received. When we come to apply it to the cosmogony we shall see what aid it will give us in solving its difficulties.

This principle may be enunciated as follows: The Holy Scriptures were given to reveal moral and spiritual truths —it is no part of their object to teach the truths of science, upon which, consequently, they are no authority—a statement which requires, however, to be elucidated, and confirmed.

A very slight acquaintance, then, with the origin, style and contents of the sacred records is enough to satisfy any one that it was no part of their object to reveal the truths of science. For they originated and were communicated to the world through a nomad sheik and his tribe, than whom no people were ever more destitute of scientific tendencies and culture. If their object had included precise and infallible statements on matters of science, probably the Greeks would have been chosen for this purpose, for scientific tendencies and adaptations were as characteristic of the Greek mind as they were foreign to the Jew. As to their style, which will require to be more fully exhibited in the sequel, it is never scientific, but always and eminently popular. And, with respect to their contents, these are chiefly great moral and spiritual truths, such as the being and personality of God, that He created the universe, and man in His own likeness, that His moral laws are of eternal and immutable obligation, that man has fallen from the estate of innocence wherein he was created, and that God has redeemed the world from sin and misery by the most holy sacrifice of His only begotten Son. These truths are the great burden of the Christian Scriptures, the great objects of Christian faith, and whatever there may be in the Bible which does not bear immediately upon them must be regarded as of secondary importance.

Yet the failure to recognize this, or the notion that the Scripture must be taken as an infallible authority, not only upon moral and spiritual, but also on scientific questions, or, at least, that its allusions and statements with respect to physical phenomena must somehow be harmonized with the results of scientific investigation—this notion extensively prevails at the present time, and is productive of the most disastrous consequences. For not only does it put into the hands of sceptical scientists their most effective weapons, but also it vitiates and poisons theology itself. For, standing on this ground, theologians are under

a necessity to defend all Scriptural allusions to physical phenomena as scientifically accurate, and this view of them as essential to a true faith in the word of God. Consequently, whenever science establishes any new truth which bears upon them, so that it can no longer be called in question by reasonable people, theologians are sorely tempted to foist into the words of Scripture a sense in harmony with it which they were never intended to bear. In this way all true principles of exegesis are confounded in order to make Divine revelation teach whatever human science, in its progressive development and unceasing changes, may at any time be thought to require. And where this expedient seems to be impracticable, they become liable to a worse temptation, namely, to deny the most certain results of science in order to maintain their faith in the revelation. For thus they have often been heard to say to scientists, This is contrary to the word of God; if you prove your point we must give up our Bible. Then, after the point has been proved and universally accepted, the scientist replies, Why do you not give up your Bible, as you said you would? Thus our holy faith is made an object of sceptical mockery.

As an example of this, we may be allowed to recall here the well-worn story of Galileo, the significance of which, as it would seem, has never yet been fully appreciated. For it is still a most instructive fact, that formerly the Scriptures were universally understood to teach the geocentric system of the physical universe—that the earth was the immovable centre of motion to the sun, moon and stars. But when Galileo came to see that this construction of the cosmos was no longer tenable, and substituted in its place the solicentric system—that the earth and other planets revolved around the sun—the alarm which was awakened in the minds of theologians by this complete revolution in astronomical science was so great that it is hardly conceivable by us at the present time. Conse-

quently they resisted it with all their immense influence; and, having "the powers that be" on their side, they compelled this foremost man of all the world to repudiate the truth in order to save his life. Now who can estimate the enormity of this scandal? Yet the lesson which it teaches has been very imperfectly learned. For similar though perhaps not such extreme oppositions to scientific discoveries have been made in our time. We have had the most embittered discussions of the age of the earth, of the length of time during which it has been inhabited by man, and of other matters of science, which theologians had long ago determined by the authority of Scriptures.

In allusion to these scandals the venerable Archibald Alexander, formerly professor in the theological seminary at Princeton, was accustomed to say to his classes:

"Young gentlemen, you should never say to the men of science, If you prove this or that, we must give up our Bible. On the contrary, you ought to say, Go on, gentlemen, make all the discoveries you can, for we are not afraid of the truth. But please to remember that, whilst you are disputing among yourselves, we are not obliged to accept the views of any party. It is our place to wait until you have come to an agreement; and when you shall have established any new truth, so that you yourselves no longer dispute about it, we will accept it without fear that it will have any bad effect on our faith. For since, as we hold, the Author of nature and of revelation is one and the same infinitely wise and good Being, true science and true religion can never have any quarrel with each other."

Now, if this beautiful rule of practical wisdom were constantly followed, it would leave little or no ground of controversy between science and religion, but harmony would be established in the future history of these two great and co-ordinate factors of Christian civilization, between which, in fact, there never has been any opposition but that which has arisen either from "science falsely so

called," or from unsound and indefensible interpretations of Scripture.

The principle which has thus been enunciated and developed we shall find abundantly confirmed, and its applications illustrated by a somewhat particular consideration of the Scriptural allusions and statements with respect to physical phenomena. For there was a necessity that such allusions should occur on every page, and almost in every sentence, from the vast number of natural objects which required to be mentioned; and these objects had to be spoken of by name long before scientific nomenclatures were invented—before there was any such thing as science in the world. Now, in what forms of expression ought we to expect that these unavoidable allusions and statements with respect to the legitimate subjects of future scientific investigation would be made—whether, in terms scientifically correct and adequate, so that no subsequent progress in science should ever be able to criticise them, or in popular language, such as was spoken at the time when the revelation was given, and such as the most illiterate and ignorant people, who yet had souls to be saved, could understand? Since the question does not seem satisfactorily to answer itself, we here undertake to demonstrate that the former method or procedure was impracticable, and that the latter was the only one that could be followed.

For if these Scriptural allusions to physical phenomena had been made in forms of expression scientifically correct and adequate, the Bible would have been unintelligible to all the generations of mankind who lived and died before the birth of science, and still such to the nations and great masses who are destitute of scientific culture. In order to see this, we need only consider that a scientific expression of the sun's rising and setting would be something like this: The earth revolving on its axis reveals and hides the sun. But, at the time the Scriptures were given, no

one, not even Moses, though learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, could have understood such words: and the expression itself is so clumsy that we ourselves cannot use it; we continue to say, The sun rises and sets, knowing all the time that it is as far as possible from being scientifically correct. Hence we cannot logically infer from their use of such expressions that the sacred writers were ignorant of the Copernican or Newtonian theory of the universe, although it would be absurd, no doubt, to suppose them acquainted with it. Since, then, these physical phenomena had to be mentioned or referred to in almost every sentence, if scientific terms had been employed, the Scriptures would have been unintelligible to all men at the time they were written, and, doubtless, would have been universally rejected as the ravings of insanity. If they could have been preserved, which is hardly supposable, no one could ever have understood them until they had come to be interpreted by modern science. Nor would they have been any more intelligible to us at this day than to those of former ages. For science is not yet perfect, nor ever indeed can be. It is constantly making progress and changing its nomenclature and its modes of conceiving of physical objects—and, doubtless, it will always continue to do so. Thus, what lately it called caloric it now calls a form or mode of motion, and the term caloric is no longer used. So, also, light, which was formerly a fluid, is now the result of vibrations in ether. Consequently, the time may come, nay, is sure to come, when many of its now current forms of expression will be found incorrect and inadequate, as involving more or less of erroneous conception and theory, and will be superseded by others in accordance with more advanced knowledge. Hence we see that these allusions in the Scriptures to physical phenomena, in order that they should be absolutely correct and unchangeable, must have been made in terms corresponding, not to the present, but to the still future and last developments of

science: in which case, they would have been unintelligible to us, and to how many of the coming generations of mankind we cannot tell.

Moreover, since it is impossible to understand a scientific expression of any great physical phenomenon, such as the rotating earth reveals and hides the sun, without acquaintance with the cosmical theory to which it belongs, it would have been necessary, in order to meet this difficulty, that there should be revealed in the Scriptures, not only the truths of religion, but also a perfect system of science. But self-evidently this was no part of the object for which they were given, and the attempt would have introduced inconceivably greater difficulties than it could have removed. For (1) it would have made the Bible of such enormous bulk that, it is safe to say, no one person could ever have read it through. (2) Such a revelation of science would itself have been utterly unintelligible. For the human mind is the subject of development. It has had to grow up through all the ages of the past, in order to become capable of mastering that vast and complex system of knowledge which is included in the word science. If such a system had been revealed from heaven with the utmost clearness, it could no more have been comprehended during the early stages of the human mind than it can be now by little children. If, *e. g.*, all that is signified by the mariner's compass, naval architecture, steam navigation, the ocean telegraph, and other such expressions, had been revealed to Cimon or Themistocles, those old Greek admirals whose most daring voyages hugged the shores of the Mediterranean, and who were hardly ever out of sight of land in their lives—is it conceivable they could have comprehended it? For it is impossible for man, even by the aid of any revelation, to bridge the great ocean of thought which lies between his knowledge at any given period and that to which he will arrive step by step in the progress of thousands of years. (3) Moreover, if we suppose that

such a revelation of science had been given, and that it could have been understood, it would have superseded that laborious exercise of the human faculties in experiment, research and reasoning which, according to all experience, is indispensable to their development and growth. For the search after truth has been held by some of the greatest minds the world has ever seen to be more conducive to mental power than the truth itself. In the words of Lessing: "If you place the truth before me, on the one hand, and on the other, the search for truth, I take the search." This may be an overstatement, but there lies in it this much at least which is unquestionable, that, as man is constituted, his intellectual faculties could never have been developed so as to comprehend science otherwise than by means of that strenuous exercise of them through which all his discoveries have been made and all his progress achieved.

Hence it is evident that there were overwhelming reasons why the revelation did not, and could not, make the necessary allusions and statements with respect to physical phenomena in scientific terms. We see here an absolute necessity that they should be managed in some other way; and we pass on now to the consideration of this other method which was actually adopted, and which, it is claimed, is followed out with perfect consistency from the first chapter of Genesis to the last of the Apocalypse.

Here, then, recurring to the typical expression, the sun rises and sets, we see that it is derived from the impression which the phenomena make upon the sense of sight—from that which appears, and not at all from the scientific truth which underlies the appearance; and this impression, let it be observed, is necessarily the same at all times and places, and for all persons on the earth. Consequently the expression which is derived from it must always have been, and must forever continue to be, universally intelligible. In whatever language of "articulately-speaking

men" it may be said, the sun rises and sets, the most ignorant and stupid people will always understand what is meant. Hence we may safely predict that this expression will continue to hold its ground through all possible changes in the scientific exploration and comprehension of the phenomena which it represents. For human language originated in, and draws its perennial nourishment from, the impressions which the phenomena of the world make upon the senses. In the Hebrew of the Old Testament, however, the corresponding expression is slightly different, being in this form, the sun goes forth and enters in. Here the impression made upon the senses is somewhat modified by a philosophical conception in explanation of the phenomena which seems to have prevailed at the time, and which is more fully unfolded in the words of the Psalmist: "The sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race." For the Hebrews, as other ancient peoples, seem to have conceived of the sun as having his sleeping chamber under the earth, from which, at one door, he came forth in the morning, and into which, at the opposite door, he re entered in the evening. Closely analyzed, this expression is found to be in part sensuous, and in part philosophical, which, no doubt, is the reason why it has not been able to maintain its ground, but has given place to the purely sensuous one which we employ. If, now, we had time to examine all the allusions and statements with respect to physical phenomena which occur in the Scriptures, we should find that they are all made in forms of expression similar to this by which the sun's apparent motion was represented; that is to say, in forms originally derived from the impressions made upon the senses, but often modified by philosophical conceptions in explanation of the phenomena which prevailed among the people to whom the revelation was immediately communicated. It remains for us to furnish satisfactory evidence upon this

point, which must consist of a few examples taken almost at random from literally thousands precisely similar.

1. First, then, the inspired writers, whether of the Old or New Testament, certainly had no knowledge of the true relation of the sun to the earth and planetary system, nor of those which the heavenly bodies in general bear to each other. For it did not enter into the purely moral and spiritual object of Divine revelation that this knowledge should be communicated to them; and, as we have seen, any attempt to reveal a complete science would have met with insuperable difficulties. Consequently they, like other people of their time, conceived of the earth as the greatest of all the cosmical bodies, and of the sun, moon and stars as dependent upon it, and as created for the benefit and service of its inhabitants. In strict accordance with this conception they never allude to the sun as the centre of attraction or motion to the planetary worlds, but everywhere they speak of all the heavenly bodies as created and placed in the firmament "to give light upon the earth," and to "be for signs and for seasons, and for days and years."

2. In the second place, the conception of the earth which uniformly appears in the Scriptures is that of a solid, immovable body, with a plane, or perhaps a slightly convex surface. This, indeed, was the conception of it which universally prevailed in ancient times; and, hence, as was inevitable, speculation was everywhere rife as to what it was founded on, or by what its weight was supported. Some imagined one thing, and some another, but no satisfactory account of the matter could be given, for obviously, in accordance with this conception, the difficulty did not admit of a final solution. In order to illustrate this point, which has important relations to others that are to follow, we subjoin here an old Hindoo scheme of the universe.*

* See Diagram in *Religions De L'Antiquité*, par. J. G. Guigniaut, Vol. vi, plate 115.

First of all, we have here a mathematical triangle, from which a glory is streaming in all directions, which among the Hindoos was an ever-recurring symbol of the *Trimurti*, or three-form ineffable nature of the Deity. For after all that has been written in explanation of this mysterious symbol, it is more than probable that a dim shadow or reflection of the Triune Jehovah had somehow fallen upon the minds of this wonderful heathen people. Immediately below this triangle, we have seven heavens, each of the superior ones resting on the next under it, which were believed to be the abodes of their inferior divinities, and of those *rishis* or sages who, by their knowledge and austerities, rather than by their moral virtues, had raised themselves to an equality with the gods. The lowest heaven rests upon celestial clouds; the clouds upon a supernal ocean; this ocean upon a solid sky or firmament; the firmament upon the backs of a troop of elephants, which stand with their feet on the earth; the earth, which is convex above but flat beneath, rests upon four other elephants of stupendous vastness, one at each of the four cardinal points of the compass—the space between them under the earth is *Patala*, or Hades—these elephants stand on the back of an immense tortoise, which rests on the coils of an enormous serpent; and this serpent, finally, after furnishing this support, forms a circle around the whole vast scheme, with its extremities meeting above the triangle, on which it seems to hang, and by which the weight of the whole universe is sustained. In this way, these old thinkers, grappling with the difficulty just alluded to, represented all the spiritual and material worlds as depending upon one triune, ineffable, Divine Being. The whole scheme, as we see, combines the puerile and the sublime in a truly wonderful manner.

Now, it is very remarkable that the Christian Scriptures are wholly free from such puerilities. For they leave the whole subject in that insoluble mystery which is insepara-

ble from this conception of the earth as a solid immovable body. In many passages of great sublimity, they represent the question as to what it was founded on as one of the deep mysteries of God. In one of these He is represented as rebuking the rebellious spirit of the patriarch Job in the following words: "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare, if thou hast understanding, who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest? Or who hath stretched the line upon it? Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened? Or who hath laid the corner-stone thereof?" Surely every attempt to explain such expressions as mere figures of speech, or in any way consistently with the conception of the earth as having no foundations, must be worse than idle—a perversion of the most certain laws of language, and such that, if similar methods be applied to the revelations of moral and spiritual truth, the result must be, that we shall get out of the Bible just what we please. Nor are the representations which occur elsewhere, such as this, "He hangeth the earth upon nothing," to be interpreted in opposition to the plain sense of the preceding quotation, and to innumerable other passages of similar import, as if they were intended to harmonize with our knowledge, that the earth is a globe suspended in space and upheld by the attraction of gravitation, but they are to be understood as simply expressive of the mystery of the thing as it lay before the minds of the sacred writers.

3. A third conception in explanation of physical phenomena which prevailed among the ancient Hebrews was, that a great body of water existed under the earth, by which they accounted for springs and wells. For this rising of water out of the ground on the tops of hills and mountain sides was a great mystery to the old world, and it is frequently alluded to in the Scriptures as a wonderful manifestation of the power of God. Thus in the following words: "He sendeth the springs into the valleys,

which run [literally, which break or rise] among the hills." Now, the sacred writers make no attempt to correct this erroneous notion in science, because that was not included in the object for which they were inspired. On the contrary, they express themselves in accordance with it in a great multitude of places and variety of connections, as in the following instances: "The earth above the waters . . . The waters under the earth . . . The deep that lieth under . . . The fountains of the great deep."

4. A fourth conception of a similar character was, that the sky was a solid substance, or firmament properly so called, which also seems to have prevailed universally in ancient times, as it still does wherever science has made little or no progress. Children always have this notion, and savages cannot be convinced to the contrary. The reason is, that the deep blue of the sky makes this impression upon the sense of sight; for how can mere void space have any color? Now, indeed, it is well known that this is due to the atmosphere which surrounds the earth, and the author has seen and handled a transparent gas, similar to the atmospheric air, but condensed and frozen solid by an experiment in the laboratory, the color of which was precisely the deep blue of the sky on a clear day. Hence the oldest names of the sky in many languages, and probably in all, either signify or imply solidity. Our word heaven means primarily that which has been heaved up by the exertion of force, and which consequently has solidity and weight. The Hebrew רָקִיעַ and the Greek *στερέωμα*, by which it is translated, and the Latin *firmamentum*, are the exact equivalents of the word firmament in the English Bible. They all alike signify that which is solid, compact, firm. They cannot be soundly interpreted in the sense of a void expanse, as some scholars, in their zeal to harmonize the Scriptural allusions to natural phenomena with science, would maintain. This interpretation is utterly inconsistent, not only with the

proper meaning of the words, but, also, as we shall see hereafter, with the connections in which they stand. For this Hebrew word, of which the Greek, Latin and English are, of course, mere translations, is derived from a root which signifies to expand by hammering out, as iron or gold or other metal is expanded into solid sheets. It has no meaning whatever apart from the idea of solidity. Accordingly we find allusions or statements expressing or implying this conception in almost all the places where the sky is mentioned in the Bible, such as the following: "Hast thou with Him spread out the sky, which is strong and as a molten looking-glass?" For the molten mirror here, as elsewhere, must, of course, be understood as being of polished metal, and we shall see directly why this quality of strength is attributed to it. Again: "And they saw the God of Israel, and there was under His feet, as it were, a paved work of a sapphire stone, and, as it were, the body [literally, the bone] of heaven." The manner in which the firmament is spoken of in the cosmogony will require to be examined hereafter, and need not be further referred to here, except to remark that the words which represent the birds as flying "in the open firmament of heaven," are now recognized by all Hebrew scholars as a mistranslation: they should be, "in the face of the firmament," that is, under it.

5. Still another conception which prevailed among the Hebrews and other ancient peoples was, that above the firmament—in which it is expressly stated that the stars were set or fixed—and this, by the way, is the origin of the expression, the fixed stars, which we still retain, though in a different sense—that above the solid sky, and supported by it, there was another great body of water, corresponding to "the water under the earth", and identical with the supernal ocean in the Hindoo scheme. This seems to have been their explanation of the phenomena of rain. For as the water in fountains and wells was supposed to come

from "the deep that lieth under", so the rain was supposed to fall from "the waters which were above the firmament." The relation which the clouds bore to rain-falls in this conception does not fully appear. Perhaps they were regarded as a kind of sieve by which the water, as it fell from the firmament, was separated into drops, and sprinkled over the earth, in order to its more effectual fertilization. There may be an allusion to this in the words: "He maketh small the drops of water ... which the clouds drop and distil". The allusions and statements in the Scriptures which either express or imply this conception of waters above the sky are almost innumerable, such as the following: "Praise him ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens ... The river of God which is full of water ... A multitude of waters in the heavens": and others which will be referred to in the sequel.

But here it should be mentioned, that some of the most striking and significant of these allusions, both to the waters above the firmament and to those under the earth, occur in the account of the deluge, where it is stated, that "all the fountains of the great deep were broken up", so that the waters under the earth burst up in boundless floods; and that "the windows [literally, the flood-gates] of heaven were opened", so that the waters above the firmament came down in mighty torrents. In this way the deluge is accounted for; and, if we fail to recognize this conception of the physical universe in which these expressions originated, the sublimity of this whole picture is well-nigh lost.

6. Besides such allusions and statements as these with respect to great cosmical phenomena, we find similar references to minor particulars of which it must suffice to reproduce here one or two examples, as follows: "The ostrich which leaveth her eggs in the earth ... and forgetteth that the foot may crush them, or that the wild beast may break them. She is hardened against her young ones, as though they were not hers. Her labor is vain,

because God hath deprived her of wisdom, neither hath he imparted to her understanding . . . The daughter of my people is become cruel like the ostriches in the wilderness". Now, it is quite true that the ostrich sometimes leaves her nest in the noon of the tropical day, as do other birds, to prevent their eggs from being actually cooked by the heat of their bodies, but these passages do not exhibit her true character and habits, as we know them from the testimony of a great number of perfectly trust-worthy eye-witnesses. For she is, in fact, an uncommonly prudent and affectionate mother-bird. She broods on her eggs with the utmost assiduity. When she leaves them for a brief space to procure food or water, the male bird takes her place on the nest till she returns. Both of them fight desperately, even to the loss of their own lives, in defence of their young. They practice the most cunning stratagems to deceive the hunter ; for, like the lapwing and some other birds, they pretend to be wounded and crippled, when he approaches their young, and go fluttering and floundering along upon the ground to draw him off in pursuit of themselves. In all this, we do not see an example of cruelty, nor a creature "hardened against her young ones, as though they were not hers", nor one which 'God has deprived of wisdom and understanding'.

7. Again, we find that animals of the pachyderm and rodent classes are prohibited by Moses as unclean on the ground that, though ruminants, as he pronounces them to be, they are not cloven-footed: "The coney, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof—he is unclean unto you: and the hare, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof—he is unclean unto you". Now the word שָׁפָן, *shaphan*, which is here erroneously translated, coney, designates, as is generally agreed, a little pachyderm animal resembling the coney, which last, as also the hare, are rodents. Both the *shaphan* and the hare are still believed by the Arabs to be ruminants, though neither of them has the

fourfold stomach, nor other traits of physical organization, which are characteristic of all animals which chew the cud. This popular error originated, no doubt, from the fact that the rodents have a peculiar motion of the mouth and cheeks, produced by their rubbing the edges of their cutting teeth upon each other to prevent them from growing too long, which gives them a striking appearance of ruminating. Now Moses, as in all similar cases, speaks of them according to this appearance, and does not recognize the scientific truth which underlies it, with which, in fact, he could have nothing to do. For the distinction between clean and unclean animals was one which all classes of his people had constantly to make, both for purposes of food and sacrifice, and in which they could discriminate no otherwise than by such outward signs; and, if they had been allowed to disregard these signs in the case of these animals, it would have been well-nigh impossible to have kept up the distinction in other cases.

To these it may be added, that the doing of certain things is claimed in Scripture as the exclusive prerogative of God, which science has since brought within the reach of human power. For the question is addressed to Job, as if but one answer could possibly be given to it: "Canst thou send lightnings, that they may go, and say unto thee, Here we are?" Now, it seems impossible to choose words which should more exactly describe what we are doing every day in connection with the electric telegraph. The lightnings do now say to us, with utmost docility, Here we are, send us; and we send them with our messages from continent to continent and from pole to pole.

These few examples are all that we have space to give—but surely they are enough—to illustrate and verify our main proposition, that the Scriptures always speak of natural phenomena in forms of expression originally derived from the impressions which they make upon the senses, but often modified by philosophical conceptions in

explanation of these phenomena, such as were current at the time when, and among the people to whom, the revelation was at first communicated. For certainly it was no part of their exclusively spiritual object to correct these impressions or conceptions, however erroneous they might be. The limitations imposed upon them by their great moral and spiritual object made it absolutely indispensable that they should never concern themselves with the scientific truths which underlie the phenomena of the physical universe, but should leave all these to be discovered and expounded by science. For if they had spoken of these things otherwise than in free and popular language, no one could have understood them ; and if they had undertaken to correct all the popular misconceptions of natural objects which prevailed, there would have been no end to the Bible—it would have been a sealed book to those who first received it, also to us at the present time, and to how many of the future generations of mankind no one can tell.

We do not claim, however, that the views which have now been presented are free from difficulties. For it may be objected against them that the two spheres of faith and science are not absolutely exclusive, but, to some extent at least, do interpenetrate and overlap upon each other; that, in the attempt to distinguish between what is of moral and spiritual import in the Scriptures and that which is not, we must be liable to very deleterious errors; that our principle of interpretation implies a low view of inspiration; and, in fine, that it cannot be applied to the Mosaic cosmogony without impairing its claim upon our faith as a Divine revelation. Now it must be conceded that these are grave objections and require to be fairly appreciated.

(1) First, then, we frankly admit that some matters of faith do come within the purview of science. But this is a difficulty which cannot be wholly avoided whatever views be taken of the subject. For, in any case, science

within her own legitimate sphere, which is that of determining the laws of nature, may have something to say on the question of miracles by way of sifting the evidence on which they rest, upon superstition and other similar matters. But the principle which we here advocate has this great advantage over all others, that it reduces to a minimum the number of those questions in which it may be claimed that both faith and science are concerned. In fact, it leaves very few, and these such as are most easily defended, in which the most sceptical science can have any temptation to deny what a true faith in the word of God must ever maintain.

(2) In the second place, our liability to error in discriminating between that which is moral and spiritual in the Word and that which is not, does not seem to be any greater than it is in the distinction which we have constantly to make between fundamentals, or essentials to salvation, and matters of secondary importance. For some things "the Scriptures principally teach;" other things are not principal, but subordinate. Now, whatever our liability to error in either case, the sole question for us is, whether God has not laid upon us the responsibility of making these distinctions. If He has, then we have the promise of the illumination and guidance of His Spirit to enable us to make the distinction aright; and, in proof that He has, we have the whole preceding argument, the force of which, however, we cannot fairly appreciate without guarding ourselves against our natural dread of responsibility. For we have the most sorrowful evidence that there is a deep longing in the human heart for a more comprehensive revelation than God has seen fit to give us. Great moral and spiritual truths do not satisfy this morbid craving. We want a Bible alike authoritative in matters of science and matters of faith. We want an infallible church to determine for us what the revelation teaches, and to decide all our perplexing cases of con-

science. This is depraved human nature; and it is the claim to such infallibility in the Romish church which, as much perhaps as anything else, attracts the ignorant multitudes who submit themselves to her authority and follow her banner. We shall err if we think ourselves exempt from this temptation; and it is indispensable that we keep ourselves on guard against it, if we would estimate at anything like its true value the evidence, that God has placed us all under the solemn responsibility of distinguishing between that in His word which belongs to the moral and spiritual object for which exclusively it was given, and that which is, so to speak, the necessary material framework in which His saving truth is exhibited to our minds.

(3) In the third place, all that has just been said is of equal force against the objection, that our principle of interpretation implies a low view of inspiration. For the question which we have to meet on this point is not surely one of high or low, but, simply, what is the true view? Yet it may be observed, that neither the highest nor the lowest is probably the truest. The former, indeed, would relieve us of the greatest amount of responsibility but the latter would go far to rob us of the word of God. The antecedent probability would seem to be in favor of a middle ground, which is proverbially the safest, and on which, as we think, the most thoughtful and learned and judicious have ever been found.

In mediis tutissimus ibis.

But however this may be, it certainly is both unphilosophical and unfair to hold the Scriptures responsible for infallible accuracy of allusion and statement in matters which they were not given to teach. And upon what rational grounds can it be demanded that they should harmonize with the results of modern science in other similar allusions with more precision than they do in those which

they make to the rising and setting of the sun? The consistent application of our principle to all similar cases cannot possibly affect our views of inspiration otherwise than as they are necessarily affected by the interpretation which we must give to these typical expressions.

(4) Finally, the objections which may be urged against applying this principle to the cosmogony are, no doubt, the most difficult of all to meet. Yet what can be more unreasonable than to require that the Bible, in this its first chapter, should treat of physical phenomena in language scientifically correct and adequate, when it does this nowhere else? Nor is it possible so to interpret its words without imposing upon them a sense which they were not intended to bear, nor without peril to great moral and spiritual interests; in other words, this procedure cannot fail to introduce far greater difficulties than those which it claims to remove.

For the interpretation which is now commonly adopted for this purpose, and which is the only one which can be made in the least plausible, includes the following particulars: Moses exhibits the creation, not as it actually took place, but as it appeared, or would have appeared, to an observer stationed on the earth: what he calls the six days of creation were, in fact, geologic or demiurgic eras of immense duration: the words create and make, in the record, are to be distinguished from each other, the former as signifying creation, properly so called, and the latter, formation out of pre-existing materials, or, simply, causing to appear. In this scheme, also, great stress is laid upon the order of creation, which, it is claimed, agrees substantially with the results of modern science.

Now against all this we urge the following counter-objections:

(a). It is a harsh and incongruous supposition that Moses intended to represent the creation, not as it actually took place, but as it would have appeared to an observer sta-

tioned on the earth, inasmuch as he gives us no intimation of any such design, and could not fail to be misunderstood, as he always has been; also, because, when the creation commenced, there was no earth upon which an observer could be stationed, and, if there had been, there was no observer to occupy it as a point of observation.

(b) The order of creation given in the cosmogony does not agree with that which science requires, in that it represents the sun as having been created on the fourth day, and the plants or vegetable world on the third. Now we know that all vegetable organisms depend for their existence on the light and heat of the sun, and it is inconceivable that they could have lived and flourished through a whole geologic age of many thousands of years before the sun was created. Also it represents the earth as having been created on the first day. Now, the cosmical dependence of the earth, as one of the planets, upon the sun as its centre of attraction and motion, render it impossible to conceive of it as existing three or four geologic ages before the sun. We say nothing of light because it is now known that it is not exclusively dependent upon the sun.

(c) It was for the purpose of removing the preceding difficulties that the distinction was invented between the words create and make. For the advocates of this scheme call our attention to the fact that it is not said, the sun was created, but that he was made on the fourth day. They understand that he was created before, although Moses says no such thing, but that he did not shine through the chaotic clouds until the fourth period. Now this distinction rests wholly on the necessities of this scheme. No other evidence has ever been advanced in support of it. Nor can it be maintained—it is perfectly arbitrary. For these two words with all their derivatives are used as equivalents and synonyms both in this record and throughout the Scriptures. Of this innumerable examples might be given such as the following: "God created the

heaven and the earth . . . The Lord God made the earth and the heavens . . . Remember thy Creator . . . Let us kneel before the Lord our Maker." Besides, it is said that God created the living creatures, where, according to this distinction, the word made ought to have been used, as it is in the case of vegetable organisms. Since, then, these words are used as equivalents, if one of them be thus limited to the sense of forming or causing to appear, the other may be also; in which case, for aught that appears, there may never have been any true or proper creation, but matter may be eternal. This is one of the great spiritual interests which are imperiled by this method of interpretation.

(d) The objections to understanding the word firmament as a void expanse, have already been given in part by analysis of the Hebrew, Greek, Latin and English words. But that is an argument which only scholars can appreciate. We now present one of a different character, of the validity of which any one can judge for himself. Let us observe, then, in what terms Moses speaks of the sky in the cosmogony itself: "And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament . . . and He set them [the sun and moon] in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth." Now, here is one of those cases previously alluded to, in which, if it be ever possible to determine the sense of a word from the connection in which it stands, this word cannot have the meaning of a void expanse. For the firmament is here represented as that which God created to divide the waters below from those which were above it; but there are no waters above the void expanse, neither are there any below it, since it is itself illimitable space. Besides, God is represented as being occupied the whole of the second day in crea-

ting the firmament—He did nothing else on that day—but how can a void expanse, that is, nothing at all, be spoken of as a work of creation? And this difficulty is greatly enhanced by taking these six days in the sense of geologic periods of immense duration. Was the Creator occupied for a hundred thousand years in creating—nothing? Surely it must be evident from all this that the firmament was conceived of by Moses as having a substance more solid than water, in order that it should divide one body of it from another; and this, by the way, gives us the reason why such great strength is ascribed to it in a previous quotation, namely, because it was supposed to sustain the weight of a superincumbent ocean.

(e) It only remains to point out that these six days are rigorously defined in the common meaning of the word by the explicit statement, that each of them had its morning and evening, and still more clearly, perhaps, by the consecration of the Sabbath on the ground that God himself "rested on the seventh day, and was refreshed." For if this seventh day be understood as of a different kind from the preceding six, the most fundamental law of logical analysis—that all the parts into which any given theme is analyzed must be obtained by application of one and the same principle—is violated. For if the first six days be taken as geologic ages, and the seventh as a period of twenty-four hours, we have seven parts which cannot be obtained from the theme on any one principle of analysis. The force of this objection will be better appreciated by students of logic and rhetoric when their attention is directed to this Mosaic scheme of creation as, beyond comparison, the most beautiful specimen of analysis within the whole compass of literature. In fine, that the word day should have a different meaning in other connections, where it occurs without any such definition or limitation, as, "In the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens," is in strict accordance with all the laws and

usages of language. But to impose such an indefinite meaning upon it in disregard of its connection, and in the face of this definition, is a violation of all exegetical rules, and even of the laws of analytic thinking, such as tends to unsettle and confound all right principles of interpretation, and of thought itself.

These are some of the objections which lie against this method of harmonizing the cosmogony with the results of modern science. Is it not evident that it imposes upon the words of Moses a sense which they were never intended to bear, imperils some of the most important of revealed truths, and thus introduces far greater difficulties than those which it claims to remove? And who can foresee where this procedure applied to other parts of the Scripture may ultimately lead us? For it is not physical science alone with which we have to do. Anthropology, also, and psychology, and biology, to say nothing of historical criticism, are now putting in their claims to govern our interpretations of the word of God—sciences which have a direct bearing upon its moral and spiritual import. Now, when we come, for precisely similar reasons, to impose upon it every meaning which the sceptical tendencies of these rapidly developing sciences may at any time seem to require, what is likely to become of its deliverances concerning the fall of man, human depravity, the incarnation and the atonement?

These difficulties seem to us immeasurably greater than any which can arise from the most rigorous application of the principle of interpretation for which we here contend. For nothing in the cosmogony itself, or in any other part of the Bible, which can possibly be claimed as of any moral or spiritual import, is in the least affected by it. No such claim can be made for the length of time during which the work of creation was going on, nor for the order in which it took place, nor for the existence of a firmament, nor for a body of water above the firmament, provided

that God be understood to have created all things constituting the universe. For evidently it was Moses' chief object to cover this one point by the particularization and details of his analysis. But in all these specifications and particulars he speaks of the physical world in free and popular language, as it is spoken of everywhere else in the Scriptures, and in accordance with the impressions which it makes upon the senses, and with the conceptions of it which prevailed when he lived, and which, no doubt, he shared with all others of his time. All these, therefore, are to be taken as the material and human framework, so to speak, of this sublime picture of the creation of the world, in which it is revealed to our faith: That there is but one only living and true God; that He is a free, personal Being of infinite wisdom, power and goodness; that by the word of His power He created all things, especially man, male and female, in His own likeness; that He consecrated one day in seven to be kept holy to himself by all mankind; and whatever else there may be in this account which is of any moral or spiritual significance. It would seem that these great truths are enough for one short chapter in the Bible. For they lie at the foundation of all true religion, and stand in direct contradiction to atheism, materialism, pantheism, dualism, polytheism, idolatry and fetishism—those deadly errors which have always dominated over the human mind wherever they have not been driven out by the revelation of himself which God has given us here and throughout the Holy Scriptures.

In conclusion, by the adoption and consistent application of this principle of interpretation, the malignant enemies of true religion—that 'seed of the serpent who are permitted to bruise the heel of the Seed of the woman, whilst He crushes their heads'—would be deprived of their deadliest fangs. For if they should find in the Scriptures innumerable allusions and statements with respect to natural

objects which are not in accordance with the scientific truths underlying the phenomena, what would it all amount to, more than is contained in the one expression, the sun rises and sets? Thus, also, science would be left free to do her own great and blessed work, unimpeded by fear or misgiving lest her ever-multiplying discoveries should come into conflict with revealed truth. Besides, which is of even greater importance, as many of her votaries as are at all sensible of their spiritual necessities—and such, no doubt, are as numerous as in any other class of people—would be relieved from their peculiar difficulties and temptations to unbelief, and would find that peace and joy which the gospel brings to the heart of every true believer. Then the aid which they would bring to its defense and propagation—who can estimate how great and effectual it would be? Moreover, the readers and interpreters of the word of God would be delivered from that sore temptation with which they are now beset, to impose upon its words meanings which they were never intended to bear, and which without abuse they cannot be made to bear—a procedure which greatly injures the conscience, and mightily confounds the science of hermeneutics. But that which perhaps is of greater importance than all other advantages is, that these "oppositions of science" would no longer dwarf the faith nor mar the peace of God's dear children, as they do now in a multitude of cases. And hence we may expect that the faith and spiritual power of the church, delivered from this incubus, will grow up to "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," and go forth again, as it did in primitive times, to conquer and save the world.

III

THE CREATION OF MAN

And God said, Let us make Man . . . And the Lord God formed the man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living soul . . . Male and female created He them . . . and called their name man in the day when they were created . . . And God created . . . every living creature that moveth . . . after their kind.

THE origin of the human race has always been a subject of universal and transcendent interest. For the question whence we have come involves also what we are and whither we are going. The answer to the first of these determines the answers which must be given to both the others. Hence the statements here made in the Mosaic record cannot be classed with those which have just been considered as matters of indifference, but must be regarded and treated as revelations of the very deepest moral and spiritual significance. Moreover, the interest in this subject was never greater than it is now, when sceptical science, transcending her legitimate sphere and invading the province of theology, calls in question the truth of this account of the origin of mankind, whereby the faith of multitudes in the word of God is shaken to its foundations. Here, then, it is in place for us to examine this record with reference to the objections which scientists have brought against it.

Before entering upon this discussion, however, it should be premised, that it is altogether irrational for us to submit our minds blindly to the general theories, hypotheses, inferences, reasonings, speculations which are so confidently

put forth in the name of science, for multitudes of them, of which only examples can be given here, are as unscientific as possible. We should ever bear in mind that scientists, like all other men, are fallible, and quite as much addicted to discursive and vain speculations. It may be safely affirmed that theology itself—which is saying a great deal—was never more given to daring and wild speculation than is physical science at the present time. Now, also, that it has become fashionable for scientists to lay before the public in popular lectures the evidences of their speculative conclusions, it is certain that many who hear them are quite as good judges of the soundness of their reasonings as they themselves can possibly be. For logic is one and the same thing in all departments of thought and life. There is not one kind of logic for physical science, another for morals, another for political economy, another for jurisprudence and another for affairs. Hence, as we might expect, and as we find it in fact, there are no better practical logicians than our ablest men of business. The statesman, the lawyer, the theologian, and the mind that has been well trained in business pursuits, are abundantly competent to judge for themselves whether the proofs adduced in support of such general speculations are conclusive or not. And when we detect in the reasonings upon which they are founded, the most palpable violations of the immutable and universal laws of reasoning, which any intelligent person may often do, as we shall see in the examples which are to follow, we need not hesitate to reject them. But, with respect to the facts established by scientific observation and experiment, the case is altogether different. For here we may well accept in faith and with gratitude those vast and priceless treasures of knowledge with which the discoveries of science are constantly enriching human life.

With this preliminary remark we proceed to observe, that it was evidently the intention of Moses here to represent the creation of a real man and woman, and that his

Adam and Eve are by no means to be regarded as mere typical or ideal beings.

No less evident is it that he represents this man and woman as the first that ever existed. For the record treats professedly of the origin of things in order to account for their existence, and with this object in view it would have been absurd in the highest degree that it should pass over in silence the origin of mankind, as it must be understood to do, if these were not the first of their kind. Whatever has been advanced in favor of the existence of pre-Adamites is altogether fanciful. For, in any case, there must have been a first man, whensoever and howsoever he may have come into being, and him we might as well call Adam, following the obvious intent of Moses, as by any other name.

Also, it lies on the face of this record that only one human pair were originally created, and that from them all mankind have lineally descended; for it is expressly stated that the name of Eve, which signifies life, was given to the woman "because she was the mother of all living". And the unity of the race which is here asserted involves some of our most important spiritual interests, such as our universal brotherhood, our duty to love one another as ourselves, our hopes for the elevation of the inferior varieties, and even our common capacity of receiving the salvation of Christ. Hence it is a matter which stands above the legitimate sphere of scientific speculation, as one concerning which Divine revelation has spoken with authority.

Yet, in opposition to the truth here revealed, it has been put forth in the name of science, that probably there were several original creations, and that men have spread over the earth from different centres of population. One reason which has been given for this is, that the several varieties of mankind, such as the white man and the negro, are so diverse that they cannot well be supposed to have descended from the same progenitors. But this is a pure speculation,

and one which is not even plausible, when we consider, that all these varieties within the common species are so identical in life that they intermarry with each other, and that these intermarriages are not only fruitful in themselves, but they produce a permanently fruitful offspring. Now, if such intermixtures should become general, which evidently is a possible supposition, all these differences would inevitably become obliterated, and what then would become of this argument for the diverse origin of mankind? In fact, we have no good reason in the present state of our knowledge to doubt but that all these divergences from the original type have been produced, in the course of ages, by the influences of climate, mode of living, social and political circumstances, and other physical, mental and moral conditions. Even the color, lips, hair, and other peculiar features of the lowest varieties are due, as is now generally admitted by scientists themselves, to thousands of years of savage life, and of exposure to the heat of a vertical sun, combined with a great amount of moisture and malaria in the atmosphere—to these and other similar conditions, unmitigated by the influences of civilization and culture and morality upon the intellect, passions and character, and through these upon the features and expression of the countenance.

This speculation, somewhat modified, has been advocated also on other grounds. For it has been advanced as probable, that human beings originated simultaneously or otherwise in considerable numbers, as well as in different countries. The late Professor Agassiz was inclined to this opinion. He would have us believe that, as plants and animals—floras and faunas—have their peculiar districts or provinces where they originated, so man is governed by the same law of origin and distribution; and he designates eight varieties of mankind as having probably originated in communities independently of each other in eight distinct "natural provinces" with their peculiar faunas. But

this notion rests on no scientific evidence, but on assumed analogies between man and the lower orders of creation. For, since bees and ants must be supposed to have originated in swarms, why not human beings, whose nature is so eminently social, in societies? Also, there are many animals and plants, such as the polar bear and the ostrich, the reindeer-moss and the palm, which cannot live in the same climates, but are strictly confined to their peculiar habitats, faunas and floras; and why should it be otherwise with the varieties of mankind? But it is evident that these analogies do not hold good on the very points on which the inference drawn from them rests. In fact, the resemblances here assumed are palpable differences. For there was a necessity that bees and ants should originate in numbers, because they cannot maintain their existence in single pairs. Their physical constitution, and the propagation of their species, necessitate their existence, from the first, in swarms. But there is no such necessity in the case of man. And though it be true that mere animals, to a certain extent at least, are confined to their peculiar climates, zones, faunas, this is not true of man, who goes everywhere on the earth's surface, makes a home for himself wherever animal life in any form can exist, lives and multiplies and prospers in all climates and faunas, as well in that of the arctic bear and the sable as in that of the ostrich and the ape. The reason of this is, that human life is elevated far above that of all other creatures into a vastly more free and wide sphere by its peculiar human endowments. Thus we see that these analogies break down precisely where they must hold good in order to raise even a probability of the diverse origin of mankind.

"The due consideration of the moral and physical nature of man might easily be made to refute all the speculation which has been advanced from the analogy of the animal creation in favor of a separate and independent origin for his several races or varieties. For the mere

animal by its nature and form is, in a certain sense, attached to the ground; it is incapable of an upright position; it cannot vary its food; it has no power to adapt itself to new circumstances; it has no knowledge of distant countries; it is of one nature, and that 'is of the earth, earthy,' being destitute of the higher intellectual powers of freedom and morality. Hence there is a fitness that it should be, as it is, subject to laws that are merely physical; that it should be the slave of nature; and that each department of nature, distinguished in its climate and vegetable productions by peculiar adaptations, should have adapted and confined to it peculiar forms of animal life. But man, in virtue of his moral and spiritual nature, is the lord of nature, not its slave, and he finds his highest development and well-being in asserting this control. He is endowed with a nature superior to that of the mere animal; his form is upright, his hands are free. Hence he is subject to other than mere physical laws; he can protect himself from the heat of the tropics, and from the cold of the polar circles; he can vary his food according to the production of each locality; the geometrical ratio of his natural increase makes it necessary that he should spread his tribes away from the place of their origin; and whilst any portion of the earth's surface remains unsubdued he feels that his work is incomplete. Hence he justly claims a wider latitude and a freer range over the earth than the mere animal can enjoy, and refuses to be confined within the faunas of the lower orders, which, in fact, are transcended by many species of the animals themselves."*

Moreover, this speculation of separate and peculiar faunas for the several varieties of mankind is rendered wholly untenable by the well-established results of lin-

* See Princeton Review, July 1862, an article on *Diversity of Species in the Human Race*, by Prof. Chester Dewey, LL. D. but which was rewritten and prepared for the press by the author of the present work from papers put into his hands by that eminent naturalist.

guistic and ethnological science. For it separates, as having originated independently, tribes and peoples whom we know from the underlying unity of their languages and dialects, and, in some cases, from the recorded history of their migrations, to have descended from the same ancestors. Thus, *e. g.*, there is nothing more certain in physical science than that the Hindoo or Brahman race, the Medes and Persians, the Greek, Latin, Keltic, Slavic and Germanic peoples, with all who have descended from them, innumerable populations which now cover a great part of the earth in all climates and zones, have sprung from ancestors who, in pre-historic times, inhabited the same country, dwelt in the same tents, and pastured the same flocks and herds, far in the wilds of central Asia. The case is precisely similar with all the Semitic or Arabic tribes, nations and peoples. Now, in the light of this one indisputable fact, the speculative notion of separate creations, whether in single pairs or in communities, for the several varieties of mankind is altogether absurd.

In fine, it is always unscientific to hypothecate more than one sufficient cause for any effect. Now the effect to be accounted for, in this case, is the peopling of the earth; and for this a single human pair, with any rate of increase which may be assigned, is a sufficient cause. For even in our time population has been known to double itself in a quarter of a century. In the early ages of the world the rate of increase may have been, and probably was, much greater from the prodigious length of human life, as recorded by Moses, and from the fertility newly bestowed in the blessing: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth." But even at the above rate the posterity of the first human pair would naturally have been, in less than a thousand years, ten times as great as the highest estimate that has ever been placed upon the population of the globe. This result was prevented, no doubt, by the violence and bloodshed which universally prevailed.

But sceptical science no longer insists upon any such objections as these, but, with characteristic levity, it is wholly occupied with one which is in flat contradiction to them all, namely, with the now fashionable hypothesis of evolution, to which, therefore, we must give special and patient attention, after one or two preliminary observations.

Such changes of front with respect to the objections now and formerly urged on scientific grounds to this record, is eminently characteristic of science. For it is essentially progressive and ever advancing to new and unforeseen points of view, from which its previous hypotheses and theories are seen to be incomplete, inadequate, inconsistent with new facts, or, as in many cases, entirely false. Hence we find it strenuously advocating at one time what it as strenuously opposes at another; and the objections which it brings against the Holy Scriptures at one stage of its progress it is almost sure, at a subsequent stage, to overthrow and trample upon. Of this, evolution affords us another notable example, besides those just referred to. For only a few years ago, it was fashionable among a certain class of scientists to mock at the Mosaic account of the deluge (which has been so wonderfully confirmed by the arrow-head inscriptions) on the ground that the different species of living creatures were so numerous that they never could have found room in Noah's ark. But now the very same scientists are moving heaven and earth to convince us that there never were any such things as permanent species, and that all organized beings have been evolved out of a few primordial forms, perhaps from a single one, and that ultimately from inorganic matter. Consequently they have dropped the above objection as a live coal. For since we have no inspired chronology in the Bible, the catastrophe of the flood may be placed as far back in the earth's history as any one chooses, and, at the time it occurred, the several varieties of land animals may have been, in the process of evolution, so few as to find

ample accommodation in the ark. Thus it is that science is constantly dealing with her own objections. Hence it is altogether irrational for us, to whom our faith in the word of God is everything, to trouble ourselves about any of her sceptical errors, until we have waited long enough to see whether she herself will not turn against them and correct them, as she has already done in so many cases. We may be sure that we shall not have very long to wait.

Meanwhile we need not be very hard upon these rash scientists. For many of them are young men who will grow wiser as they grow older; and although infidels, with their keen instinct, everywhere welcome and defend extreme views of evolution as unanswerable arguments against the truth of the Holy Scriptures, yet all evolutionists are not infidels, nor even sceptics. Some of them make credible professions of faith in Divine revelation, and declare that, as they understand it, they find it entirely consistent with their scientific views. Some are pronounced Theists, whether Christians or not, who earnestly maintain that the forces of nature, by which the processes of evolution are supposed to be carried on, are not in any sense the properties of matter, but must be conceived of as the uniform action or energy of the Divine will. Others, whilst regarding these forces as truly the properties of matter, escape the gulf of scepticism by holding also that nothing but a personal or voluntary act of God could have endowed it with these properties. Others still exclude the human soul entirely from the hypothesis, and maintain that, for its existence, a creative act of God must be supposed. There are others, however, and unfortunately not a few, who affirm that the forces of nature are the properties of matter in such a sense that it is wholly unscientific to look beyond them—that the question, how it came to be endowed with these properties, is forever excluded from the field of scientific investigation, and from the domain of human knowledge—and that matter with these properties being given, all

things may be accounted for and explained. These are the agnostics who attribute to matter nearly all the powers which Theists ascribe to God, and for whom it would seem that materialism and atheism itself are unavoidable.

We come now to offer some counter-objections of a strictly scientific or logical character, against this boasted hypothesis of evolution, in so far as it denies the permanence of species in organic nature, and claims that the human race has been evolved out of some pre-existing animal form; all which stands in avowed opposition to the Mosaic account of the creation of man, and to the statement, so often repeated, that every living creature was made 'after its kind.' But in order to this, it is necessary to enter here into some discussion of the essential nature and proper definition of species in organized beings.

And, first, the principle of classification, as is well known, lies at the foundation of science, and of human knowledge. Hence we find it everywhere represented in the languages of mankind; for every common term is the name of a class. Now classes are formed by the mental processes of abstraction, comparison and generalization. For whenever we direct our attention to individual objects, we immediately begin, by an instinct of reason, to compare them with each other, and to note their points of resemblance and difference. Those which resemble each other in the greatest number of particulars we group together, and thus form our primary or lowest classes. Such a class of individuals is termed a species, which, in organized beings, corresponds to "kind" in the Mosaic record. These primary classes we now compare with each other, noting their points of resemblance and difference, and group them into classes of classes. Such a class is called a genus. Applying the same process to these higher classes with similar results, when we have carried it as far as possible, we are finally arrested at one highest of all classes, which is that of undifferenced being. The word being, as denoting simply

that which exists, and the word thing, which means whatever can be thought of, are different names for the highest class which it is possible to form, unless the latter be regarded as the most comprehensive. Now, among all these classes, and in every branch of science alike, that which bears the name of species, being composed of individual objects having the greatest resemblance to each other, is the most important, because upon it every system of classification rests.

But here a great difficulty is encountered in determining the limits of species from the fact, that a great number of individual objects, especially in organic nature, are found on inspection of their mutual resemblances to shade off by almost or quite insensible gradations, and even to overlap, so to speak, upon each other. Thus, the Virginia mocking-bird, one of the thrushes, and the most richly endowed of all singing birds, seems to partake of the nature of the hawk; to a certain extent it is a bird of prey, for, in its wild state, it will kill and eat a sparrow as naturally as does the sparrow-hawk. In addition to this, creatures which bear the closest resemblance to each other in their outward appearance, are often found to be very different in their inward structure; and those which are most alike both in appearance and structure often differ greatly in their physiological characters,in life, and life's powers, faculties and manifestations. The Saint Bernard and terrier dogs, *e. g.*, have little outward resemblance, but their life is so nearly or quite identical, that it can be freely propagated between them, and their offspring are also fertile, one with another. On the other hand, the Muscovy and common ducks bear a much stronger resemblance to each other, yet are they so diverse in life that, although it can be propagated between them, their offspring is a hybrid or mule, in which consequently the development of life and variation on that line comes to an end. Also it has been often asserted by evolutionists that the Caucasian man of the

highest type and the negro of the lowest differ from each other in appearance and structure more than the negro and orang or chimpanzee; but the former are so completely identical in life that it is not only propagated between them with the utmost freedom, but their offspring, one with another, are as fertile as themselves; whilst the negro and orang are so diverse in life that it cannot be propagated between them at all. Thus it appears that the veiled mystery of life is most salient, and its distinctions most capable of being apprehended, in the phenomena of its reproduction.

For these and other all-controlling reasons, our elder naturalists, with hardly an exception, agreed in regarding as subordinate all other points of resemblance and difference for the purpose of determining the limits of species in the organic world, and in attaching a paramount importance to the physiological traits of life's organs, functions, operations and manifestations. Thus it was that Linnæus, the founder of the modern science of natural history, selected those organs in plants by which their life is propagated, and, neglecting all other resemblances and differences, erected upon them his all-comprehending system of classification. Thus also the naturalists of succeeding times have classified all known organized beings, grouping together in the same species all that were possessed of such a unity of life as that it could be propagated between them in a permanently fruitful form, and, in different species, all between which it could not be so propagated. Not that experiments upon this point were actually made in one case out of a thousand, but hybridity was universally regarded as a test of species in this sense, that all organized beings which might be proved capable of propagating, one with another, a permanently fruitful offspring, should be classed in the same, and all that were incapable of this, in different species. The divergences arising from intermixture and other circumstances among the individuals of the same species were

also made the basis of certain fluctuating subdivisions which, with the strictest regard to etymological propriety, were termed varieties.

Now these statements furnish us with a definition of species in the organic world which is sharply determinative of the extent and limits of the idea; for thus we see that such species can be nothing else but that unity of life in a group of organized beings, in virtue of which they resemble each other, and are normally capable of propagating with each other a permanently fruitful offspring. And this definition was substantially concurred in by all naturalists, with hardly an exception, until the rise of evolution, as we have it in the following passage from "the still classical work of Cuvier."

"The birth of organized beings is the greatest mystery of the organic economy and of all nature. ... All organized beings produce similar ones; otherwise, death being the natural consequence of life, their species would not endure.... There is no proof that all the differences which now distinguish organized beings are such as might have been produced by circumstances: all that has been advanced upon this subject is hypothetical. Experience seems to show, on the contrary, that, in the actual state of things, varieties are confined within rather narrow limits; and, so far as we can retrace antiquity, we perceive that these limits were the same as at present. We are obliged, then, to admit of certain forms which, since the origin of things, have been perpetuated without exceeding these limits; and all the beings appertaining to one of these forms constitute what is called a species. Varieties are accidental sub-divisions of species.... Fixed forms which are perpetuated by generation distinguish their species... Generation being the only means of ascertaining the limits to which varieties may extend, species should be defined, the reunion of individuals descended one from the other, or

from common parents, or from such as resemble them as closely as they resemble each other." *

To this should be added from another source: "Allied species produce between themselves an infertile offspring: remote species of the same genus are those between which hybrids are never produced."

Now it is admitted on all hands, for it is undeniable, that this characterization of species, in which, as has been said, all the elder naturalists are substantially agreed, marks a real and most important distinction in the actual state of things, and represents a vast range of facts in the organic world. For an immense number of organized beings can and do interbreed with each other, producing offspring which are no less fruitful than themselves; and a far greater number either cannot interbreed with each other at all, or their offspring are infertile. Here, then, we raise against evolution the question, ought not the classifications of science to mark, signalize, and emphasize this broad physiological difference between organized beings? Can true science utterly ignore it in her classifications, as if it did not exist? Yet this is just what all evolutionists are obliged to do. The fact, indeed, is so undeniable, and of such vast significance that they cannot help recognizing it from time to time, but the point here made against them is, that in their so-called scientific classifications, the prime object of which is to mark and emphasize resemblances and differences, they utterly ignore it, as if it did not exist. Is this true science?

The hypothesis itself, however, is such that its advocates cannot do otherwise. For it is the assumption that there is no such distinction in permanence; that, wherever it exists at present, it is the result of circumstances; that all the differences between existing species have arisen through gradual divergences, in the course of innumerable ages,

* *Animal Kingdom*, edited by Dr. Carpenter. Introduction, pp. 18, 19.

among the descendants of common parents, which formerly were, and whose offspring may again become, capable of interbreeding with each other. Consequently they spare no pains to eliminate it from their characterization of species. For although for obvious reasons, they commonly fight shy of precise definitions, yet they explain with sufficient clearness the new meaning which they would, if they could, attach to the word. Thus Professor Huxley :*

"If, in a state of nature, you find any two groups of living beings which are separated from each other by some constantly recurring characteristic, I don't care how slight and trivial, so long as it is defined and constant, and does not depend upon sexual peculiarities, then all naturalists agree in calling them two species; that is what is meant by the word species—that is to say, it is, for the practical naturalist, a mere question of structural differences." †

Now, all this is very curious. For by this expression, "a mere question of structural differences," he excludes from consideration, in the determination of species, all such as are physiological and biological, in other words, all the phenomena of life, among which, of course, are those of its propagation, which, as we have seen, are the most significant of all the differences by which organized beings are distinguished from each other. Moreover, these phenomena of life are just those which distinguish living creatures as such, the very objects to be classified. Yet are they to have no weight or consideration whatever in determining the species of such creatures. These are to be classified without regard to that which makes them what

* In this discussion, we have preferred to quote from Prof. Huxley, rather than from Herbert Spencer, Darwin, Wallace, and others, because he is acknowledged to be one of the ablest, best known and outspoken of them all, and he sees more clearly than others the difficulties under which the hypothesis labors, and more frankly admits them. Also he represents what he himself has observed and verified, whilst Spencer deals in "glittering generalities," and with facts as he has learned them mostly from hearsay.

† Huxley's *Origin of Species*, p. 104.

they are. This is what evolutionists call science! Also, the statement that "all naturalists agree" in determining species by "any constantly recurring characteristic no matter how slight and trivial," is as far from the truth as possible. The truth is, that no naturalist, not even Professor Huxley himself, practically distinguishes species by any such test as this. For it would require him to class the white man and the negro in different species on the ground of the "constantly recurring characteristic" of their opposite colors. But this neither he nor any other evolutionist pretends to do, for it is excluded by their fundamental hypothesis; and in the work already referred to, he says explicitly:

"I am one who believes [*sic*] that, at present, there is no evidence whatever for saying that mankind sprang originally from any more than a single pair; I must say that I cannot see any good ground whatever, or any tenable sort of evidence, for believing that there is more than one species of man." *

He has forgotten the constantly recurring though trivial characteristic of color, by which the white and the black man are distinguished from each other. Thus he finds it impossible to abide by his own characterization of species. In fact, he loses sight of it on almost every page of the work in which it is so formally laid down, and uses the word as including physiological traits, which he has expressly excluded from consideration. Thus, *e. g.*, he says: "Hybrids are crosses between distinct [but allied] species." How comes it that hybrids are never produced otherwise than between distinct species, if hybridity has nothing to do with the determination of species?" Again: "Between species, in many cases [remote species] you cannot succeed in obtaining the first cross." Why so, if the reproduction of life is never considered in separating species from each other? Once more: "Here is a feature, then, great or small

* *Origin of Species*, p. 113.

as it may be, which distinguishes natural species." The feature includes the two facts just stated, and surely it is not an open question, whether it is "great or small." But, further, what does he mean by "natural species?" Evidently such as can produce no offspring at all between them, or their offspring are hybrids; and there is no other kind of species, unless evolutionists have discovered some which are unnatural, of which they have not, and probably will not claim the credit. For certainly true science knows nothing of any but natural species, the distinctions between which exist in nature. Here, now, we have on a single page * three examples, taken at random from innumerable others, in which Professor Huxley recognizes physiological distinctions between species, and uses the word precisely as defined by Cuvier and the elder naturalists, except that they had no occasion to put "natural" before it. We see in these quotations and criticisms the sense which evolutionists, in the interest of their hypothesis, would attach to the word species, and how utterly unable they themselves are to use it in this sense from the opposition which they everywhere encounter in the stubborn facts of nature.

We come now to examine the arguments upon which they rely for the overthrow of the old definition of species, and for the establishment of their hypothesis, in the course of which we shall see with what reason Cuvier could say in the words previously quoted: "There is no proof that all the differences which now distinguish organized beings are such as may have been produced by circumstances. All that has been advanced upon this subject is hypothetical." For these statements are as true now as when put on record by that great man: to the present day all that has been advanced in favor of evolution, as an explanation of the origin of man and of life, is "hypothetical."

* Huxley's *Origin of Species*, p. 107.

There are but two such arguments, each of which, however, consists of a multitude of particulars.

The first of these is the argument from analogy, which is thus stated by Professor Packard :*

"Reasoning *a priori* we assume that organisms, both plant and animal, have been created [developed] out of pre-existent forms, because it agrees with the general course of nature. All agree that the solar system was evolved; that the earth was evolved....that the nebular hypothesis is necessary to account for the origin of our earth."

Hence evolutionists assume that plants and animals have been produced by this process of evolution. In so far, then, as the hypothesis rests upon analogy, it can be no better characterized than it is in these words of one of its advocates, as a mere 'assumption.' But this argument includes also the many cases in which organic forms which had been hastily regarded as belonging to different species, have been discovered, upon more perfect knowledge of them, to be mere varieties of the same, as the squirrels of tropical America, *e. g.*, have been reduced from fifty-nine to twelve species. Evolutionists lay much stress on such discoveries, as if they indicated that the differences between all species might, conceivably at least, be thus reduced. But here, as in many other cases, their logic is manifestly at fault; for all that such reductions can prove is, that naturalists are liable to error, and have erred, through imperfect knowledge, as was unavoidable, in classing as of different, what were in truth varieties of the same species. Nor does it matter how many more such discoveries may be made, in so far as evolution is concerned, because whatever definition of species be adopted, in ten thousand cases for each one of them, it must still and forever remain as impossible to reduce the differences between all organized beings to a

* The New York *Independent*, Feb. 5, 1880.

unity as it is for the lion to interbreed with the cow, or the mouse with the elephant.

But, in addition to this, we must ever bear in mind that this whole argument from analogy, however numerous the particulars it may include, can never, with its utmost logical force, prove that anything is so; the most that it can do is to prove that it may be so, and to raise an antecedent probability in its favor. For it was thus that Leverrier reasoned from many strong analogies to the probability that there was a certain undiscovered planet on the outskirts of our solar system; but he did not pretend that this was to be received as a truth of science, until he had discovered and could show his planet, Neptune, through his telescope. Upon this evidence from analogy, therefore, whilst scientists may fairly accept evolution as a good working hypothesis, which is full of suggestion, and which may lead, as it has led, to many important discoveries, yet they cannot logically claim for it the character of a scientific truth which others are obliged to accept, and with which all other known truths must be harmonized, until it shall have been demonstrated by proofs of an entirely different character. This, however, they themselves will frankly concede.

Accordingly, they bring forward another argument, namely, that the hypothesis will account for, explain, render intelligible a vast number of facts in nature, especially the resemblances and differences between organized beings. These facts are such as the following: The manner in which these differences and resemblances shade off into, and overlap upon each other by almost insensible gradations, especially as this has been disclosed by late discoveries of fossil remains; the changes which have been observed in organized beings under the influence of circumstances, such as those by which it is admitted the various races or types of mankind have become distinguished from each other; the origination of new forms in the lapse of

ages, and the perishing of such as were ill adapted to, and the preservation of those which were in harmony with, their changing physical conditions and surroundings; the existence of rudimentary organs—the rudimentary human hand in the whale's flipper; the male mammæ which, according to evolutionists, have been dwarfed, or have fallen into a state of atrophy, by ages of disuse; all the female organs in the male, and all the male organs in the female, in a similar rudimentary or atrophied condition—these are only a few examples of a vast multitude of facts in organic nature which it is claimed that this hypothesis will account for and render intelligible.

Now we must admit that this argument, which is strictly inductive in its character, would, if it were without flaw and perfect, be demonstrative; that is to say, if the hypothesis were in itself conceivable, and if it would fairly account for all the facts to which it properly applies, and if these facts could be accounted for in no other way, then we should be obliged to accept evolution as a scientific truth, because it would rest on evidence precisely similar and equal to that upon which we receive the Newtonian theory of gravitation. But, unfortunately for its advocates, all these three necessary conditions are wanting, as we now proceed to show

In the first place, then, it is not claimed that it will account satisfactorily for all the facts to which it properly applies. It is admitted on all hands that it labors under as yet unsolved difficulties, some of which are of a strictly physical character. Among these is the fact, previously referred to, that individuals of different species can produce either no offspring at all, or their offspring are infertile. For what good reason can be given why the descendants of the same parents should ever come to be normally incapable of continuous propagation with each other. Mr. Darwin, indeed, has endeavored to account for it, but in such a lame and impotent manner that he has not been able

to satisfy his brother evolutionists. This, as we shall see directly, is frankly admitted by Professor Huxley. There are also a vast number of other facts, and these the most important of all, namely, the facts of human consciousness, of which evolution gives us no rational account. This also is fully admitted by some evolutionists, who, therefore, exclude these facts and the human soul entirely from their hypothesis, and hold it in application only to the organic world, including the physical nature of man. But the greatest number of its advocates, and all the ablest logicians among them, steadfastly refuse to make this exception; for they see plainly enough that, if it can be applied to the mental faculties of animals, wonderful as these are, no scientific interest requires that those of men should be excluded. In fact, this exception is made by those only who try in this way to conserve their religious faith. But inasmuch as this objection against the hypothesis, that it does not rationally account for the phenomena of consciousness, has been frequently and strongly pressed by others, we need do little more than state it here.

Our mental faculties, then, and their operations—reason, sensibility and will—our conceptions of abstract, universal and necessary truths; our ideas of the true, the beautiful and the good; our moral nature, the distinctions we make between right and wrong; our capacity of the knowledge of the invisible, supersensual, spiritual world, and, pre-eminently, of God; our consciousness of freedom, of moral obligation, and of immortality—none of these great salient facts can be accounted for by the operation of the uniform forces of nature, nor by the properties of matter whatever "potentialities" be ascribed to it, nor in any way consistently with evolution. Its advocates do, indeed, make spasmodic efforts to explain the phenomena of our moral nature; but the best they can do is to tell us that our distinctions between right and wrong are nothing but the summation or result of the experiences of good and evil

through which our ancestors have passed, in the course of innumerable ages, transmitted to us their descendants by the principle or law of heredity; in other words, that what was in them a distinction based upon their experience becomes in us, under the operations of this law, a distinction independent of and prior to our experience. In the same way, they strive to account for the operation of animal instinct. But in both they signally fail. For it is incredible that bees, *e. g.*, which have made no improvement since they first began to be observed, should have learned, by manifold experiments and innumerable failures, how to construct their perfect hexagonal cells, which combine the greatest possible mechanical strength and capacity of contents with the least possible expenditure of material and waste of room: otherwise, their intellectual faculties, for such purposes at least, must be regarded as vastly superior to those of human beings. A similar remark is equally true of the operations of an ant-hill, of the flight of birds of passage, of the unerring return of the young fish from their wanderings in the ocean to the river or stream where they were spawned and hatched, and of all the phenomena of instinct properly so called. Much more is this explanation inadequate to the phenomena of the conscience in man, the most fundamental and essential elements of which, namely, its moral character and its authority, it leaves wholly unexplained. For it does not touch our consciousness of moral obligation, which obviously is not contained in, and consequently cannot be derived from, the mere experience of good and evil, however prolonged through innumerable generations. Neither does it touch the authority with which the conscience delivers its sacred oracles, that "categorical imperative," the awful impression of which the philosopher Kant could compare to nothing but that of the starry firmament. In fact, this explanation reduces one of the greatest of all mysteries—that of "the voice of God in man"—to a faculty of mere prudential wisdom, to man's selfish regard for his

own happiness. This is not to account for facts, but to deny, or at least to ignore them. In like manner our sensibility to the charms of sublimity and beauty, the admiration we feel for an act of noble self-sacrifice, the promptings of great and heroic souls, our indignation at injustice, oppression and cruelty—all these and other similar facts of consciousness are rationally incomprehensible on the hypothesis of our derivation from ape-like animals in which no such susceptibilities have ever appeared. Above all, the phenomena of the human will, especially its freedom, can never be accounted for by the properties of matter, nor from the uniform operation of natural forces, nor in any way consistently with evolution. For, if we know anything, it is that the will of man is not subject to the uniformity of natural laws, and that it is *αὐτοκίνητον*, a self-moving, self-directing power. Human life, as depending upon and proceeding from the will, does not run in fixed grooves, like the wheels of a steam-engine. We have the power to choose for ourselves whether we will do right or wrong, which is a freedom absolutely inconceivable as a property of matter, or as a quality of the natural forces.

Now in this state of the case, with such an array of most significant facts which evolution does not rationally account for, and with many others which, it is conceded, present as yet unsolved difficulties, the fact, that it does account for a great number of phenomena in organic nature is not sufficient evidence to establish it as a scientific truth. For other hypotheses, as is well known, have been maintained on precisely similar grounds, and yet have subsequently been found untenable. In astronomy, *e. g.*, the Ptolemaic or geocentric construction of the solar system was universally accepted for thousands of years, because it accounted for a vast number of celestial phenomena; also the "Vortices" of Descartes accounted for almost as many of them as the theory of gravitation itself. Yet both of these celebrated hypotheses have long been universally rejected,

and few persons are now aware of what a place in science they formerly occupied. Such, therefore, notwithstanding the number of facts which it is claimed that it will explain, may hereafter be the fate of evolution. Professor Huxley is well aware of this, and prudently hedges himself as follows:

"You must understand that I accept it [evolution] provisionally, in exactly the same way that I accept any other hypothesis. Men of science do not pledge themselves to creeds... There is not a single belief that it is not a bounden duty with them to hold with a light hand, and to part with cheerfully the moment it is really proved to be contrary to any fact, great or small." *

Yet all this is in palpable contradiction to what immediately precedes, for it is difficult to conceive of any words in which he could more emphatically pledge himself to the creed of evolution than as follows:

"I think it is Mr. Darwin's hypothesis or nothing; that either we must take his view, or look upon the whole of organic nature as an enigma, the meaning of which is wholly hidden from us." †

But it is very far from being true that "it is either Mr. Darwin's hypothesis or nothing." For, in the second place, all the facts which can be accounted for by evolution, are equally well accounted for on another and totally different hypothesis, namely, that of the distinct and independent creation of species, as defined by Cuvier and the elder naturalists. Evolutionists may be safely challenged to produce a solitary fact which is inconsistent with this latter hypothesis. Certain it is that such a fact they have never yet produced. They contend, indeed, that this view of creation is rendered improbable by many facts, and some of them assert that it is utterly overthrown by late discoveries among fossil remains of intermediate forms, which, as they claim, render the transition of one species into

* *Origin of Species*, p. 145. † Ib. p. 144.

another an easy matter. Thus Professor Huxley, in his New York lectures, ventures to assert that if but one more "missing link" should be discovered, namely, a horse with five toes, "evolution would be demonstrated." But here again he sets all logic at defiance. For what if this intermediate form were found? Nay, what if any number of such approximations should be discovered, and the structural differences between species should be reduced to a minimum, how could that "demonstrate" that any one species had been actually derived from, or evolved out of another, whilst the bar of their inability to interbreed remains between them, and whilst their closest resemblances can be fully accounted for on another hypothesis? How many things bear such resemblances, which yet are not pretended to have sprung one from another? The planets of our solar system are very much alike, but this does not even suggest that Venus has been evolved out of the earth, or Mars out of Jupiter. Such is the logic of evolutionists, by which they "demonstrate" their hypothesis!

But, if we concede that either of these hypotheses will equally well account for all the facts in question—which, with the phenomena of human consciousness before us, is a vast concession—there would still remain a logical necessity for an *experimentum crucis*, a crucial test, that is, a fact verified and established, which could be accounted for by one of them, but not by the other, in order to determine, on scientific evidence, which of them is to be preferred. Now the only such crucial test which is conceivable as resulting in favor of evolution is an actual observed and verified transition or transformation of one species into another, such as that of a dog into a cat, or a cow into a bison, an ass into a horse, or a chestnut tree into an oak—such a transition, or the development of a new species out of a pre-existing one, so that their members shall be incapable of crossing breed with each other.

In order that this hypothesis should rise even to the character of a scientific theory, at least one beast must be observed to have become a man, or one animal or one vegetable to have been transformed into another of a different or new species. But no such transformation has ever been known to take place. No evolutionist pretends to have discovered this crucial test. In two or three cases, indeed, doubtful claims have been put forth to the evolution of new species from pre-existing ones among the lowest organisms; but, in all these cases, the species have been distinguished by mere structural divergences, and the question, whether they could interbreed, or not, upon which in this argument everything depends, has never been tested. Professor Huxley has given this subject an extended discussion, in which we shall see more fully that he constantly uses the word species, not in the sense in which he himself has defined it, but altogether as defined by Cuvier and the elder naturalists, and also that his admissions abundantly confirm our previous statements.

"We have seen," he says, "that breeds, known to have been derived from a common stock by selection, may be as different in their structure from the original stock as species may be different from each other. But is this true of the physiological characteristics of animals? Do the physiological differences of varieties amount in degree to those observed between forms which naturalists call distinct species? [in direct contradiction to what he tells us in his own definition, as previously quoted, that "all naturalists agree" in classing as of distinct species individuals separated by mere structural differences.] This is most important for us to consider... For there is a most singular circumstance in respect to natural species [what other than natural species are known in science and nature?] at least about some of them [no exception has ever been named] and it would be sufficient for the purposes of this argument if it were true of only one of them, but there

is, in fact, a great number of such cases [all without exception]—and that is, that similar as they may be to mere races or breeds [varieties] they present a marked peculiarity in the reproductive process... If you take members of two distinct species [again] however similar they may be to each other, and make them breed together, you will find a check... If you cross two such species with each other, then—although you may get offspring in the cross [allied species] yet, if you attempt to breed from the products of that crossing, which are called hybrids... the result is that, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, you will get no offspring at all... Between species, in many cases, you cannot succeed in obtaining the first cross [remote species]... This is a very extraordinary circumstance. One does not see why it should be [sure enough—no evolutionist can—and here he frankly admits that evolution cannot account for this fact]... Here is a feature, then, great or small as it may be [no small about it] which distinguishes natural species [again] of animals. Can we find any approximation to this in the different races [varieties] known to be produced by selective breeding from a common stock? Up to the present time the answer to that question is absolutely a negative one. As far as known at present, there is nothing approximating to this check... Here you see is a physiological contrast between races [varieties] and natural species [again]... By selective breeding we can produce structural divergences as great as those of species [once more] but we cannot produce equal physiological divergences* ... Mr. Darwin, in order to place his views beyond the reach of all possible assault, ought to be able to demonstrate the possibility of developing from a particular stock by selective breeding two forms which should be unable to cross, one with another, or whose cross-breed offspring should be infertile, one with another... Now it is ad-

* *Origin of Species*, pp. 104–111.

mitted on all hands that, at present, so far as experiments have gone, it has not been found possible to produce this complete physiological divergence . . . If you have not done that, you have not shown that you can produce, by the cause assumed [evolution] all the phenomena which you have in nature . . . If it could be proved, not only that this *has* not been done, but that it *cannot* be done [so, by what law of logic does he require us to prove a negative?] . . . If it could be demonstrated that this is impossible [sic] . . . I hold Mr. Darwin's hypothesis would be utterly shattered." *

Now, we have been compelled to leave out much of this long-winded discussion, which is loaded with verbiage, as it would seem if it were not for the fatal admissions, for the purpose of disguising difficulties, but we have given in the author's own words his exact meaning, as any one may see by reference to the pages quoted. Here, then, we have it fully and expressly admitted that the crucial test which the hypothesis of evolution requires has not been discovered, and we are gravely challenged to prove the negative, that its discovery is impossible, as if the burden of proof rested upon its opponents, and not as it does wholly upon its advocates! For, to all intents and purposes, the hypothesis is "utterly shattered" whilst the proof which is admitted to be indispensable to establish it cannot be produced. No, the evolutionists do not pretend to have discovered their crucial test. They tell us that they have not yet had sufficient time, for one such transformation of species may require many thousands or even millions of years. Thus in the words of Professor Jevons:

"The deeper differences between plants have been produced by the differentiating action of circumstances during millions of years, so that it would naturally require millions of years to undo this result, and prove experi-

* Ib. pp. 140-141.

mentally that the forms can be approximated together again."*

Here, also, it is fully admitted that the hypothesis is a mere speculation which cannot be experimentally, that is to say, scientifically proved, at least, for millions of years to come. But give us time enough, they say, and we will show you plenty of such transformations. Well, we will give them all the time they ask, and a million of years hence, when they shall claim to have discovered one such fact in organic nature, we will—examine it.

Having now shown that the hypothesis of evolution does not account for a multitude of facts to which it properly applies and that these facts can all be accounted for on an entirely different hypothesis, we come now to demonstrate that the third and final one of the three conditions necessary for its establishment as a truth of science, namely, that it should be conceivable in itself, is wholly wanting. For it necessarily involves and implies particulars, details, processes of transition or transformation which can, by no possibility, be represented to the mind, of which no conception can be formed, which are absolutely unthinkable. Among these are the origin of vegetable life from inorganic, dead matter, that of animal life, with its capacities of pleasure and pain and all its mental faculties, from the vegetable, the transformation of sexless into sexual beings, the separation of the two sexes, previously combined in the same individual, into individuals of either sex alone, the transition of insensible, irrational, involuntary, impersonal, unmoral things into sensible, rational, voluntary, personal, moral beings. Not one of these transformations is conceivable, or thinkable, in the several steps, details, processes which it necessarily implies. Nor is the difficulty lessened, though it is veiled and disguised—on the contrary, it is vastly increased—by the

* *Principles of Science*, p. 414.

immense length of time which is required and allowed for each of them. Especially, with respect to the evolution of sexual out of sexless forms, we have a logical right to ask, what was their condition at each step or stage of the transformation? In what conceivable way could their existence have been preserved, and their species, if species they can be said to have had, propagated, during those hundreds of thousands of years whilst they were neither one thing nor the other, but partly sexual and partly sexless forms? Let any one undertake to represent to his imagination the procedure and details of what must be supposed to have taken place, and assuredly he will find that they are inconceivable. Again, the separation of the two sexes—what were the several steps and particulars of the process? Whilst that which is now the male was ceasing to bear children; whilst his mammæ, now dwarfed and atrophied by ages of disuse, were ceasing to give suck; whilst all the other female organs in the male were thus falling into a state of atrophy: in like manner, whilst that which is now the female was beginning to bear separately; whilst her bosom was in the process of development; whilst all the male organs in her body were falling into a similar state of atrophy—whilst these, together with all the other prodigious changes of internal structure and physiological characteristics in both which are necessarily implied, were going on—what then, through all the ages of this transformation, were the physical and mental conditions of the creature which is now the male and female man? How was its existence maintained and its species (?) propagated during those immense periods of time whilst it was neither male nor female, but partly both? Is it not evident to all men that, before we can be even plausibly required to accept this hypothesis as a truth of science, we have a logical right to demand of its advocates that they shall represent intelligibly all the steps, stages, processes, details, if not those which were actually fol-

lowed, at least those by which these stupendous transformations might possibly or conceivably have taken place? Yet none of them, though they have been often challenged, and though the necessity of it is palpable to all men, have ever dared or attempted to provide us with any such scheme, and this, for the best of all reasons, because it cannot be done. For all these transformations which have been enumerated, together with innumerable others necessarily involved in the hypothesis, include particulars, procedures, details which no mind can, by any possibility, represent intelligibly to other minds, nor to itself — which are absolutely unthinkable. Now what other refutation of any hypothesis or theory does science require than that, in its particulars, it is unthinkable?

The late lamented Professor Henry, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, whilst he filled the chair of physics in Princeton College, was always very full and explicit on the nature and uses of physical hypotheses and theories. He took great pains to impress upon his classes that they were very useful for one purpose, namely, in giving direction to experiment and research looking to new discoveries. Thus he was accustomed to say: "Young gentlemen, your hypothesis is good for just so many facts or truths to the discovery of which it can lead you. When it will yield you no more discoveries, you have no further use for it—you may throw it away." Now, agreeably to this view, it is undeniable that evolution has opened new paths of scientific investigation, and led to the discovery of many new facts and truths in the organic world. Neither have we any reason to think that it is yet exhausted. For scientists it may long continue to be a good and fruitful working hypothesis. But, for such reasons as those which have been given, it has no claim whatever to be regarded as an established truth of science, with which other known truths, especially such as are revealed to our faith in the word of God, must be harmonized. It does not give us

the shadow of a reason for doubt with respect to the truth of the Mosaic account of the creation of man taken in the most obvious and natural sense of the record. And it is safe to predict that the time is not far distant when this now fashionable hypothesis, as an explanation of the origin of species, and of the Divine mystery of life, will be cast by scientists themselves "to the moles and the bats," with the Ptolemaic system of astronomy, the Vortices of Descartes, the notion that nature abhors a vacuum, and other Baconian "idols of the tribe and the theatre."

IV

THE DUPLEX NATURE OF MAN IN THE IMAGE OF GOD

The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul. . . God created man in his own image; in the image of God created He him.

It has always been perceived that these words could not be limited to the first man, but must apply also to mankind —that what is here treated of is the creation of man as such. For to the question of the catechisms, "Who created you?" every Christian child is taught to answer, "God." God creates all men by his almighty power as truly as He created Adam. It is true, the method according to which the thing is done is not the same, being modified by the new conditions introduced in the relations which the child bears to its human parents, but the efficient causality, the creative energy, is the same in both cases. For, as we have seen, the forces of nature are in no sense the properties of matter, but must be conceived of as the acts or energy of the Divine will; and the laws of nature are not powers, but simply the uniform methods according to which God chooses to act in the natural world. If it were not for this uniformity of method in the procreation of children, it would be as perfect a miracle as was the creation of the first man. It seems to have been with some insight into this great truth, which lies at the foundation of all true religion, that the mother of mankind exclaimed at the birth of her first-born, "I have gotten a man from the Lord." The Psalmist also refers to it in the words of

glowing praise, as follows: "I will praise thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made... Thou hast covered me in my mother's womb... My substance was not hid from thee when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance yet being unperfect, and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them."

The particulars of this statement, that 'God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, so that he became a living soul,' are significant of what is no less true of mankind. For the material out of which the human body is now formed is the nourishment supplied to the mother, which, in one form or another, is always produced from the earth; and still that by which man becomes a living soul is the breath of God, as truly as it was in the case of Adam. The statement, therefore, may be understood as representing the truth, that man as such is composed of two distinct natures, the one a material and the other a spiritual substance, in the unity of one personality. For, of course, it is the material part of him which is formed out of the dust of the ground, and it may fairly be inferred that the breath of God by which he becomes a living soul is intended to represent his immaterial, spiritual and moral nature, since no such expression is employed in respect to any of the inferior creatures. This inference, however, does not in the least depend upon the meaning of the word "soul," which in the Scriptures is often applied to mere animals, but is drawn solely from the fact, that the soul of man exclusively is here represented as the breath of God. The question, whether it is derived immediately from God (creationism) or mediately through the souls of the parents (traducianism) is one of no moral significance in this connection, since, in either case, God is its true author and source. And this distinction between that

in man which is "of the earth, earthy," and that which is spiritual and moral, is another great truth of this record, which also lies at the foundation of our holy religion. For each of these two natures in man has its own distinct and peculiar faculties and endowments, which can be distinguished from those of the other, inasmuch as one class are common to all animals, whilst the other are peculiar to, and manifest themselves in man alone. Thus, at the head, so to speak, of the material nature in man and all other animals, there is a certain faculty of sense, or of knowledge by means of the senses, or of sensual wisdom, which gives all its practical judgments for the guidance of the creature's life from an earthy point of view, for the gratification of the appetites, passions, desires, affections which have their seat in the body, without any sort of reference to the spiritual and moral world—to the distinction between right and wrong, to immortality, or to God—about which, in fact, it knows and can know nothing. And it seems to be this faculty of earthly and sensual wisdom in man which, when he falls wholly under it, and his life is altogether governed by it, is characterized in the Scriptures as "the carnal mind," "the mind of the flesh," "the wisdom of man," "the wisdom of this world," and by other similar descriptive terms. In like manner, there stands at the head of the endowments of the spiritual nature in man a certain spiritual faculty, whether simple or complex, by which he is rendered capable of the distinction between right and wrong, of moral obligation, and of the knowledge of the supersensual and spiritual world, especially, of God and the immortality of the soul. Now the most prominent and striking mode of activity in this faculty is the conscience, which has been often and well called "the voice of God in man," because it seems to be best comprehended as the organ through which God reveals his distinctions between good and evil in the forms of right and wrong, commanding the one, and forbidding the other, on

his own absolute authority. But, perhaps, the true nature and functions of the conscience may be best illustrated in a figure, as follows: Man is created to be a temple and palace for the indwelling of his Maker—"Whose house are we"—in which are many beautiful and wonderful compartments. Here, first, is the outer court of the senses, which surrounds the whole building. Crossing this, and penetrating further into the sacred enclosure, we have, on the right hand, the chamber of the intellect, reason, or powers of thought, and on the left, that of the sensibilities and affections. More interior still, communicating with both these, and through them with the court of the senses, we come to the chamber of the will—the will, which is the steward of the house. Beyond this, in the very centre of the building, we enter a secret chamber, which communicates with all the others, and which is lighted only from above. This is the place of the conscience. Here we behold what seems to be both an altar or shrine and a throne, upon which the light streams down from above, and is reflected with soft radiance through the room. He who sits upon this throne and is worshipped on this altar, being invisible, is "the architect and builder" [*τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς*] of the house; and from this central point He sends forth through all its compartments His oracles of distinction between good and evil in the forms of command and prohibition, for the ordering and government of his household.

Such, in a figure, as best we can conceive of it, is the conscience in man, the supreme faculty of his spiritual nature. Hence the absolute authority with which it delivers its sacred oracles, which demands implicit, unhesitating submission and obedience, and which can be rationally comprehended no otherwise than as being the authority of God. Hence, also, the feeling of moral obligation with which it binds all the other faculties of the human soul, and of which we are so deeply conscious. The conception

of this great mystery of our being which we here endeavor to unfold is this: When that which is good in the sight of God is presented to our minds, and we hear the conscience aright, it says to us, This is right; this thou shalt do; doing this it shall be well with thee—thou shalt live: and, when that which is evil in the sight of God is presented, the voice of the conscience, rightly heard, says, This is wrong; this thou shalt not do; doing this it shall not be well with thee—thou shalt surely die. Accordingly we find by experience that, when we are submissive and obedient to this Divinely authoritative direction, it is well with us—we are at peace with God and with ourselves: but when we are disobedient and rebellious, it is not well with us—there is no peace between God and our souls—we are troubled with self-condemnation, shame, remorse and fear. The voice within us gives no further account of itself. Otherwise than by the absolute authority with which it speaks, it does not tell us "whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth." Least of all does it afford us any explanation of the reasons upon which its mysterious distinctions between what it commands and what it forbids are grounded. For these reasons, as will more fully appear in the sequel, are such as it is impossible for us with our finite faculties to appreciate—such as none but God himself can comprehend by His all-perfect knowledge of the infinite and eternal distinction between good and evil, and of the infinite series of consequences which flow from all human actions.

Here, however, it is by no means claimed that the conscience, in our present fallen state, is an infallible guide. For its heavenly light has been darkened, and its authority, in some sort, dethroned by the entrance of sin into the temple of God. Its sacred oracles, though not wholly drowned by the turmoil and clamor of rebellious appetites and passions, are not now heard with their original fulness and certainty and authority. We are constantly liable to mistake our own wisdom and desires for the voice of God

in our souls. But in the first man, whilst yet the image of God in his soul remained in all its integrity, and the Divine law written in his heart had not yet been defaced nor obscured by sin, the conscience, surely, must be conceived of as giving forth its oracles with a certainty and power which he could not mistake, and as constituting for him an infallible guide and law of distinction between good and evil. In confirmation of this view, we may refer to the analogy of instinct in animals, by which they distinguish between what is good and what is evil for themselves, prior to experience, and without foresight of the consequences of their actions. Conscience in the first man before he had sinned was the infallible and all-controlling instinct of his spiritual nature, after a manner analogous to that in which animal instinct is yet a sort of conscience in irrational creatures.

With respect now to the image or likeness of God in which it is here declared that man was originally created, this declaration has a peculiar fitness and propriety, standing, as it does, at the opening of Divine revelation, inasmuch as it sets forth the one fact or condition which makes it possible for God to reveal himself to our minds. For it is an inconceivable thing that He should make himself known to any creature which has in it nothing of His likeness. It follows from this, a further reason of which we shall see directly, that these words must be intended to include all mankind, and to declare that they also are created in the image of God; for this likeness, although it has been defaced and obscured, has not been wholly obliterated by sin. This was clearly perceived by our English translators of the Bible, as appears from their rendering of the Hebrew word, man, in its universal form, notwithstanding, in the original, it has in this place the definite article. Probably they regarded themselves as warranted in this by the fact, that a certain image of God in all men is frequently recognized in the subsequent Scriptures. Thus, in the law

given to Noah, it is enjoined that the murderer shall be put to death for this reason, that "in the image of God made He man"; where the word still has the article. But evidently this reason has no force, except upon the assumption that the murdered person, whoever he might be, was made in the image of God. In the New Testament, also, the unbridled tongue is condemned as that "wherewith curse we men which are made in the similitude of God."

Now the reason why some likeness of God in men is an indispensable condition of His revelation of himself to them, is, that beings which are altogether dissimilar cannot commune with, nor understand each other. This is assumed in the reasoning of the apostle John where he says of the Lord: "We know that we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." In fact, it is impossible for us to form a conception of anything in God the similitude of which we do not find in ourselves. Whatever there may be in His infinite fulness to which there is nothing in us that in anywise corresponds, must forever remain unknown to us. Hence the names by which we express what we know of His attributes and perfections are universally the names of faculties or qualities in ourselves. Thus, the words, knowledge, wisdom, power, justice, holiness, love, and the like, express ideas which we derive wholly from our own experience. For, self-evidently, if we were destitute of intelligence, we could not ascribe intelligence to God. This is equally true, though not in all cases so obvious, of all other attributes which we ascribe to Him, yet, with this qualification, that we conceive of them in Him as being original, independent, infinite and perfect, whilst that which corresponds to them in us is derived, dependent, finite, and every way imperfect. Hence the image or likeness of God in man consists in intelligence or reason, in affections or sensibility, and in volition or will, which, in vital union, constitute personality. Here, then, we have God revealed to us as a personal being, which is another of

the fundamental truths of religion. In like manner, the sense of justice in us is the image of justice in God, and so of love, pity, truth, holiness, and all His attributes.

Moreover, whatever there is in us is derived from, and is constantly dependent upon, that in God of which it is the image or reflection, sin only, with all its consequences, being excepted. For every thing which has been introduced into our nature by sin is derived from a different source, is in the image of Satan, and renders us unlike God. With respect now to this dependence of man upon God, it may be compared to that of a person's likeness in a mirror upon the person himself. Whilst he stands before the glass, his form and features are reflected in it. The image moves as he moves, and perishes the moment he withdraws himself. Thus it is, in some sort, that the being and attributes of God, mysteriously reflected, after the manner of the infinite in the finite, become the being and attributes of man. Thus our intelligence, sensibility and will are the reflection of the intelligence, sensibility and will of God. Thus our spiritual and moral nature is the reflection of the spiritual and moral nature of God. Justice, holiness, goodness and truth have no existence in us otherwise than as the finite and dependent reflection of that in God which is their original and eternal substance. We are sustained in existence every moment by His power as truly and immediately as the image in a mirror by the presence of him whose reflection it is: and if He should cease to reflect himself in space and time, the whole race of mankind, and the universe itself, would instantly perish, as the figures vanish from the mirrors when the company retires from the thronged hall. In this sense it is written: "For in Him we live and move and have our being... Who upholdeth all things by the word of His power... And by Him all things consist."

In this comparison, moreover, we discern the transcend-

ent nature of the being and attributes of God, according as the living person transcends his reflection in a mirror. For God is infinitely above all the ideas or conceptions of Him which we can form. When we have ascribed to Him all conceivable perfections, He is above that which we have imagined Him to be. The largest and noblest meanings which we can attach to such words as being, power, wisdom, truth, holiness, justice, goodness and love, are nothing more than index fingers pointing upwards to that in Him which we call by these names. That to which they point remains ever transcendent—infinitely beyond our highest conceptions: "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is high as heaven; what canst thou do? It is deeper than hell [Sheol] what canst thou know?" This is one reason why we are forbidden to represent God under any material image, for such representations can do nothing but degrade Him in our eyes. This, also, is one of the truths contained in His great and terrible name, Jehovah, which properly signifies, not, I am that I am, but I am He who is, as if in comparison with Him, being itself could hardly be predicated of any creature. And this was symbolized, though under a pantheistic conception, by the veiled statue of the Egyptian Isis, with its mystical inscription: "I am all that has been, is, and shall be; and no mortal has ever lifted my veil." 'For God only hath immortality, dwelling in light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen, nor can see, to whom be honor and power everlasting, amen.'

It would seem, then, that the best conception we can form of the image of God in the first man before he had sinned, is that of a reflection from a perfect mirror. It was like that of the starry heavens reflected from the surface of a pure and serene lake, when unruffled by a breath of air, and undefiled by the swollen mountain streams. And in order that the perfection of this image

should be preserved, it was necessary that man should continue to recognize himself as such a dependent reflection of the being and attributes of his Maker. For the moment he should aspire to an independent, self-originated, self-sustained life and agency, his likeness to God would necessarily be marred, defaced, distorted. This would be, in some sort, as if the reflection in a mirror should assume to itself an independent agency, and should begin to mock and caricature the features and motions of the person from whom it is reflected. In fact, it was just such a breach of moral law and spiritual order which God beheld when man began to act as from himself in violation of the Divine command. For sin consists at bottom in the creature's losing the sense and recognition of its Creator—in the aspiration to independence of 'Him in whom it lives and moves and has its being.'

It should be further observed, that the image of God in the spiritual nature of man is again reflected in his material form. This is evident from the sense of incongruity which is awakened in us by the supposition of a brute nature in a human body, or of a human spirit in the form of any mere animal. Instantly we are conscious of a shocking incongruity. For, in the one case, the form would be a loathsome prison rather than a suitable organism, and, in the other, it would be necessary that the monster should be either chained up or destroyed. Hence the word upright, in reference to the human form, has come to signify in all languages, honest or just—the upright stature of man being everywhere regarded as an image or symbol of moral uprightness. Hence, also, to stumble and fall means to commit sin. In like manner, the freedom of the human hands and arms, as contrasted with the fore-legs and feet of animals, which are confined to the ground, reflects and represents the freedom of man's will. In fine, his clear and lofty eye, adapted to looking upwards rather than downwards, symbolizes his capacity

for the knowledge of spiritual and Divine things—the knowledge of God, immortality and heaven. Hence the ever-memorable words of the Roman poet. *

The full and constant recognition of the transcendent nature of the being and attributes of God is our only effectual safe-guard against anthropomorphism, which is the attempt to attain unto God by bringing Him down to us. For this is an error to which all men are prone, and one which is hardly less common now among Christians than it was among the Greeks, when St. Paul preached against it in Athens. Too often we think of God as altogether such a one as are we ourselves: "Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thyself." Too often we forget that He is incomprehensible—in all His modes of being and attributes as far above the loftiest flight of our thoughts as the firmament is above the reach of our arms—transcending all our conceptions, as the person of a man transcends his likeness reflected in a mirror. It is in this sense He declares: "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord: for as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." The most perfect conceptions we can form of Him are altogether inadequate, being derived from the dependent and now distorted reflection in us, and not from the all-perfect and eternal substance in Him. Moreover, it is only in presence of the Incomprehensible that our minds are humbled and subdued to faith. The Infinite alone can we

* Pronaque cum spectent animalia cetera terram,
Os homini sublime dedit, cœlumque tueri
Jussit, et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus.

Whilst, in their forms and in their nature prone,
All other creatures look upon the ground,
Feature and form sublime to man He gave,
And bade him look with steady eyes to heaven.

Ovid. *Met.* l. 2.

truly reverence and adore. As the object of our worship, God must be regarded as transcendently above the noblest conceptions that we can form of His attributes and perfections.

V

THE TEMPTATION IN THE GARDEN OF EDEN

The Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there He put the man whom He had formed. And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food—the tree of life, also, in the midst of the garden and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying: Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil—thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. . . Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made: and he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die, for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil.

THE infidel Voltaire, in his ribald way, has somewhere observed that the "story of the garden of Eden only shows how much the God of Jews and Christians cares for his apples, and how little for his children." Now the misunderstanding of the record which is evinced by this blasphemous remark is hardly more gross and inexcusable than that which has generally prevailed among Christians themselves. For it has been commonly supposed that this forbidden tree was placed in the primal abode of our first parents as a trial of their faith and obedience, to prove them, whether they would obey, or not, by giving them a ready occasion for disobedience, if

they should choose to avail themselves of it. But this notion is never once alluded to in the Scriptures, nor are there any rational grounds for it. On the contrary, these two trees in the midst of the garden were, by their profound symbolical* significance, as we must now undertake

* The symbolical character of the historical transactions connected with the garden of Eden is evinced by such considerations as the following: 1. The analogy of other scriptural narratives, such as that of the brazen serpent in the wilderness. 2. The significance of the names of persons and things, such as those of "the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," which are similar to the tree of liberty, the castle of indolence, the palace of desire; for if language be not here used at random, the names of these two trees must be interpreted as symbols under which something pertaining to life and to the knowledge of good and evil is represented. 3. The universality of the things here treated of; the creation of man from the dust of the ground, the distinction of sex, the temptation and sin of man, shame, the pains of childbirth, labor, sorrow and death. These things are co-extensive with the human race; but if we have nothing here but a literal narrative concerning Adam and Eve, it gives us no information of the origin of these things in mankind. Hence, in the words of President Edwards: "There is scarcely a word, that we have any account of, which God ever said to Adam or Eve but which does manifestly include their posterity in the meaning and design of it." And, with certain obvious qualifications, this is equally true of what is said about them, of their own words and actions, and of the circumstances in which they were placed. 4. A symbolical meaning is frequently drawn from these events by the Lord and His apostles, as in His prohibition of divorce at the pleasure of the husband: "Have ye not read that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said: For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore, they are no more twain, but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together let not man put asunder." Now, however valid this may have been as a reason why Adam should not divorce Eve, it cannot be made to apply to other men except by regarding it as a sacred symbol under which God has declared His will with respect to marriage in general. Also, St. Paul argues from the fact, that "Adam was first formed, then Eve," and that she "was first in the transgression," that woman as such is not to usurp authority over her husband. But evidently this reasoning has no force except upon the assumption that the order in which the first man and woman were created and fell into sin was a symbolical transaction. For otherwise this sequence, though it might be a good reason why Eve should not usurp authority over Adam, would be no reason at all why other women should be put under the same law. It would seem that this evidence of the symbolical character of these transactions leaves nothing to desire, although we shall find it abundantly confirmed by the analysis given in the text of the symbols themselves.

to show. Divinely adapted to guard and conserve man's innocence and happiness; in other words, they were placed in the garden to represent and to impress upon his mind and heart, those very truths by which alone was it possible that he should be kept from sinning, and should continue in that holy and blessed state wherein he was created.

For this "garden of the Lord," or paradise of delight, with its beautiful trees and spontaneous flowers and fruits, was not only a place of abode perfectly adapted to the simplicity and innocence of the first human pair, but also it constituted a most vivid image or symbol of their inward and spiritual life. And in order that it might serve this purpose with respect to the deepest mysteries of their moral and spiritual nature, these two trees were placed in the midst of it, both, as it would seem, equally fair to the eye and fruitful; the fruit of one apparently as good for food as that of the other; yet carefully distinguished by different significant names, and by the fact, that of the one they were allowed to eat, whilst the other was solemnly prohibited under the penalty of death. What, then, we must inquire here, are the great truths which these two symbolical trees were intended and adapted to signify to the minds of our first parents and to all their posterity? Especially, what was and is eternally forbidden to man in the prohibition which God laid upon the tree of the knowledge of good and evil? This is the fundamental question, upon the solution of which all rational understanding of this mysterious transaction depends.

In order to solve it, we must here take into consideration the necessity under which man, even in his estate of innocence, must have been placed, for an infallible guidance, in order that it should continue to be well with him. For, whatever conceivably might have been his circumstances, even though there had been no forbidden tree in his paradise, yet his life must necessarily have been passed between two worlds of good and evil, inasmuch as this is a

condition which no creature can, by any possibility, escape, because it results from the obvious fact, that all good things have their opposites, which must be evil. Thus, if truth, justice, temperance, to love God and our neighbor, food and exercise, be good for us, then falsehood, injustice, intemperance, to hate God and our neighbor, idleness and poison, must be evil for us; it is not conceivable that it should be otherwise. And these two worlds of good and evil between which every one's life must be passed are practically infinite. For every human action has its effects and consequences, both upon its subject and object, to which no limits can be assigned, which naturally run on forever. Especially does every thought, affection, volition and action exert a reflex influence upon its subject, and render him, to some extent at least, a different being from what he was before. Every indulgence in narcotics or intoxicants tends, as is well known, to strengthen the appetite which craves them, enfeebles the power of resistance to the temptation, and renders their victim more prone to such indulgences. The confirmed drunkard and opium-eater, how changed, how fallen from what they once were! On the other hand, by every act of relieving the necessities of the poor and suffering, or of Christian sympathy and liberality in any other form, our disposition to sympathy, charity and liberality is developed and strengthened. Thus, by the exercise of pure and holy affections we become more pure and holy; by impurity we become more impure. Moreover, the changes which are thus wrought in our characters necessarily affect all our subsequent agency, rendering it, with all its results, different from what it would otherwise have been. Hence the effects and consequences of our actions naturally run on accumulating forever—are practically infinite. All this, indeed, is so insensible that commonly we think little about it, yet is it inevitable as are the results of any physical law. It is like the incessant dropping of water, which

seems to produce no effect, but by which, in time, the whole rock is worn away. In fine, because the effects and consequences of our moral agency are thus infinite, they cannot be comprehended, nor predicted, nor foreseen by our finite faculties, so that, in view of them, it is impossible for us to choose aright between good and evil. As a matter of universal experience, they turn out to be different from what we anticipate. That which seems to us evil to do, or to suffer, often produces the most blessed fruits, and that which seems most desirable is often fraught with measureless evil: to all which it must be added, that both the good and evil fruits of our actions become known to us only through experience, after the actions themselves have been performed, and can never be recalled.

Now, all this must have been just as true of the first man before he had sinned as it is for us, because it is a necessary condition of finite intelligence. It was as impossible for him to foresee the infinite consequences of good or evil which would flow from his actions as it is for us. Hence it always was, and is, and forever must be, impossible for man to distinguish and choose aright between good and evil by his own prudential wisdom. Left to his own guidance, the first man would not only have been liable to error,* but he would have been under a fatal necessity of mistaking, at some time, through mere defect of knowledge, evil for good, and thus, from the infinite consequences of such a mistake, of bringing himself under the endless dominion of evil. Hence he could not be, and was not, left to the guidance of his own prudential wisdom; but, as we must conceive of him from the moment of his creation, he was placed under the infallible direction of the wisdom of God in his conscience, to govern his every act of discernment and choice, as the lower animals

* Both the Hebrew word חַטָּאת and the Greek *ἁμαρτία*, sin, primarily signify an error, mistake, blunder.

are directed by their unerring instincts. For howsoever this Divine guidance may have been revealed to him, whether by inward monitions, or oral commandments, as in the case of the forbidden tree, it must have reached and taken effect in his conscience, whose function it was, as we have seen, to hear the voice of God in his soul.

Thus we see that there were certain great truths which needed to be indelibly impressed upon the minds and hearts of our first parents, in order to the possibility of their continuing in their original estate of innocence and bliss, namely: (1) That their lives, even in paradise, must be passed, and their every act must be a choice, between two worlds of good and evil: (2) That, for the purpose of right discrimination between these two worlds, they could not rely upon their own prudential wisdom, but must hold themselves, in every choice and act, implicitly submissive and obedient to the authority of the wisdom of God in their consciences, which marked that which was good for them to choose and do as right, and commanded it, and which stigmatized the evil as wrong, and prohibited it: (3) That, if they should cease to heed the sacred oracle of God in their bosoms, and undertake to guide themselves by their own shortsighted and fallible insights and reasonings—the moment they should set up their own prudential wisdom as their guide and law of distinction and choice between good and evil, and should choose what might seem good in their own eyes, instead of what was good in the eyes of God, as enjoined upon them in their consciences—they could not fail to choose amiss, evil for good, nor to plunge themselves into the world of evil.

Now, by what conceivable means could these truths be most vividly represented to their minds, and most powerfully impressed upon their hearts? This was the problem which God seems to have placed before His mind from the moment of their creation, and which He solved, according to His all-perfect wisdom, in the arrangement of the two

symbolical trees in the midst of their paradisiacal abode, the significance of which remains to be considered.

With respect to the forbidden tree, its symbolical meaning would have been more obvious if its name had been correctly rendered in the English version of the Scriptures, and in accordance with similar expressions wherever they occur. For of the child that should be born of a virgin, it is said: "Butter and honey shall he eat [he shall be nourished with the choicest spiritual food] that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good: for before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings." Now this passage evidently refers to early childhood, whilst the moral nature is yet undeveloped, and the voice of the conscience distinguishing between right and wrong is not yet heard. Again, with respect to the entrance of the children of Israel into the promised land, it is said: "Your children, which in that day had no knowledge between good and evil—they shall go in thither, and unto them will I give it, and they shall possess it." Now the Hebrew words in the name of this tree which are translated "the knowledge of good and evil" are precisely the same with those which are here properly rendered "knowledge between good and evil." Beyond a question, their meaning is the same in both places; whence we see that the real name of this tree was, "the tree of the knowledge between good and evil." This was clearly perceived by Augustine, who expressly says that it "was named the tree of the science of distinguishing between [dignoscendi] good and evil."

These two symbolical trees, then, in that they stood in the midst of man's life-sphere, and in that one of them was allowed and the other was prohibited to his eating, represented the truth, that his life must necessarily be passed, and his every act must be a discrimination and choice, between things allowed and things forbidden, that is, between

the two worlds of good and evil. In that they were equally fair to the eye, and, to all appearance, equally good for food, but more especially, in that it was the tree of the knowledge between good and evil which was prohibited upon the penalty of death, they represented the truth, that he could not distinguish between good and evil by his own prudential wisdom, that he was prohibited from all attempts to do so, and that, the moment he should attempt it, he would inevitably subject himself to the sum of all evils. The tree of life, in that it was so named, and he was allowed to eat of its fruit, represented the truth, that his life of innocence, holiness and happiness would be perennially nourished and conserved by his constantly choosing and doing that which was marked for him as right and good and commanded by the wisdom and authority of God in his conscience. In fine, that no reasons were given him why one tree was allowed and the other forbidden, represented the truth, that God's distinctions between good and evil were grounded upon reasons which it was impossible for him to comprehend or appreciate, which could not be revealed to his finite understanding, which he must not attempt to bring under the test of his own reasoning, insight, or foresight, but must hold himself, in every choice and act, implicitly submissive and obedient to the commands and prohibitions of his Divine guide.

Thus interpreted, according to the best ascertained laws of symbolic representation, these two trees must be recognized as the two holy sacraments of the primeval church. For in their general character and object, they correspond, in the closest manner, to the two sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which our Saviour, with his perfect knowledge of our spiritual wants, ordained in the Christian church to represent and seal upon our hearts the great and fundamental truths of his gospel by which we live. Not at all, therefore, were they placed in the midst of man's primitive abode to prove him, whether he would

obey, or not, nor as a ready occasion or temptation to disobedience—God forbid!—but to represent in sensible form, and to impress upon his mind and heart, the truths of his spiritual life, as means indispensable and Divinely adapted to the safe-guard of his innocence and happiness. And whether he discerned the full significance of this grand symbolic representation, or not, in the nature of things, he must have been deeply sensible to its broad and general impression, just as Christians are powerfully impressed by the sacraments of the church, even when they comprehend but a little of their unfathomable meaning. Thus we see that the love of God for his redeemed people beams forth from the sacrament of the holy supper with hardly greater effulgence or splendor than does his fatherly tenderness for his first human children from these two symbolic trees in the midst of their earthly paradise. For without them, the sin and fall of man would not only have been possible, as it must have been in any case, but it would have been inevitable, just as where the Christian sacraments are rejected, there the precious truths which they represent and are intended to seal upon men's hearts soon become inoperative, and finally perish out of their minds.

We are now prepared to understand in a rational way the nature of the temptation under which man sinned and fell. And reserving all discussion of the tempter for a future study, we may notice here that he addressed himself to the woman apart from her husband, for what reason we are not informed, but probably with a subtle forecast which was fully justified by the result, that she would become his pliant and efficient instrument for the seduction of her husband. However this may be, it is of much greater importance for us to observe, that his representations concerning the Divine prohibition took effect in her mind, and awakened corresponding thoughts and sentiments. This is evident from the fact, that she believed him, and that his temptation was successful. By his sub-

tle power, he seems to have spoken his words into her very soul, so that these, as they appear on the record, no less than her own words, must be taken as expressing what passed in her experience. This has been well expressed as follows: "The old serpent deceived our race, and poisoned its root, by that well-chosen temptation addressed to our first parents: Ye shall be as gods knowing good and evil. He seems to have spoken the word into their very souls, so that it became a part of their being."

He begins, then, with questioning the Divine prohibition: "Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" This question, interpreted by the Hebrew idiom which it contains, properly signifies: Is there, indeed, any tree in the garden of which God has forbidden you to eat? His words took effect in the woman's mind, and became in her a sceptical questioning of the prohibition, which was the commencement of her bosom sin. For there was no occasion for it, nor does it matter to what it applied. It may be that the prohibition had made too feeble an impression upon her memory, so that a doubt began to arise, whether, indeed, it had ever been given; for some such forgetfulness seems to be implied in the words of her subsequent attempt to excuse her transgression: "The serpent beguiled me [literally, caused me to forget], and I did eat." But this was sin; for in that the command had been given, it was the thing which *ought* to have been remembered, whatever else might be forgotten. Or a doubt may have arisen in her mind, whether she had understood it aright; and this was sin, for when God speaks, He means to be understood, and whoever does not understand Him must either accuse Him of not speaking with sufficient plainness, or convict himself of not hearing as he *ought* to hear. Or this questioning may have applied, as somewhere in the temptation, no doubt, it did, to the reasons for which such a mysterious prohibition had been laid upon them: Why has God forbidden us to

eat of this beautiful tree? If there is any harm in it, why has He not told us what it is? For what reason has He placed us under this authoritative law which renders no account to us of the grounds of its mysterious distinctions? Now all such questioning, in so far as it implies reluctance or hesitation to obey, is sin. For thereby man cites the wisdom of God to the bar of his own wisdom, and requires it to give account of itself before that inferior tribunal, which, as we have seen, it cannot do, because God's distinctions are grounded upon His incommunicable knowledge of the essential and eternal difference and opposition between good and evil, and of the infinite series of effects and consequences which flow from moral actions, which, in the nature of the case, it is impossible for the finite mind to comprehend. Hence the Word or Wisdom of God, howsoever He reveals Himself, must "speak with authority, and not as the scribes."

The reply of the woman: "We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden, but of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die"—these words are not to be understood as adding anything to the Divine prohibition, but simply as re-affirming it in its certainty and rigor. They represent a reaction in the mind of the woman against her sceptical doubts, and a re-affirmation of the command in her conscience. For such re-affirmation of its authoritative deliverances is all that can be obtained from the conscience by whatever questions it may be pressed.

From questioning the tempter proceeds to impudent denial of the truth and sincerity of God, and to a slanderous charge of malice against Him, which he sustains by a plausible, but wholly false interpretation of the symbolical name of the forbidden tree. "Ye shall not surely die [ye shall not die at all], for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be

as God knowing good and evil." The sense of these words also entered into the woman, and must be taken as representing the progress of her own thoughts and desires. But here, again, a fundamental question arises, namely, what precisely was the object of desire, or the benefit, which the tempter set before her mind in these words, as an inducement to violate the Divine prohibition? This question requires to be the more carefully elucidated because it is obscured by certain difficulties of interpretation.

For it has commonly been supposed that this object of desire was the experimental knowledge of evil, in distinction from good. But this cannot possibly be the true meaning of the tempter's words, which require to be rendered, Ye shall be as [or like] God, knowing good and evil. For everywhere else in this record, the same Hebrew word אֱלֹהִים, though plural in form, is translated in the singular, because it is always the subject of a singular verb. Probably it was not so rendered here in English with reference to the subsequent words of God: "Behold, the man is become as one of us to know good and evil.* But this expression, as all interpreters agree, does not imply a plurality of Gods, and, consequently, cannot justify the translation of the word in the plural here. Now it is utterly inconceivable that either the woman or her husband should become, in any sense, more like God by the experimental knowledge of evil, for God certainly has no such experience. In no intelligible sense, was man rendered more like God by sinning against Him than he was before; but, in every way, he was made more unlike Him; for sin it was, and nothing else, which mutilated and shattered that image or likeness of his Maker in which he had been created. No less inconceivable is it that the experimental knowledge of evil, which is precisely the same thing as to

* For the evidence that these words are ironical, see pp. 208-214

suffer it, should be an object of desire to any rational being. Thus interpreted, the tempter's words, instead of being a solicitation by the promise of a benefit, become a palpable warning or threat, that, if she should eat of the tree, she should surely suffer for it. In fine, these words represent the knowledge of good, no less than of evil, as the object to be obtained by eating of the fruit of this tree, and to limit this knowledge to evil alone is not to interpret, but to pervert them. In fact, this notion is one of those miserable errors which, by their extensive prevalence, have covered this whole subject with almost impenetrable darkness.

But, now, if we bear in mind what has been already determined, with respect to the impossibility of the finite mind's distinguishing between good and evil by its own wisdom, we shall have no difficulty in understanding what that object of desire and aspiration on the part of the woman was for the attainment of which the tempter represents to her that she might venture to transgress even the command of her Maker. "Ye shall be as God knowing [discerning between] good and evil," he says; the meaning of which plainly is, If you will eat of the fruit of this mysterious tree, instead of incurring death, or any evil, as God has falsely declared that you shall, the eyes of your understandings shall be opened, as he knew that they would, and as the name of the tree itself signifies, so that you will be enabled infallibly to discern and choose between good and evil for yourselves by your own wisdom. Thus you will obtain emancipation from your present blind and slavish dependence upon Him for guidance and direction, in which He seeks to hold you by forbidding you to eat of this goodly tree: you will become independent of Him in thought and life, yea, equal to Him in that you will be a law unto yourselves, and will hold your welfare and happiness absolutely and forever in your own hands.

The woman believed these slanderous and malignant lies. They entered into her soul, and reproduced themselves in her experience. For when she saw that the wisdom of God would not condescend to justify itself at the bar of her wisdom, which, as we have seen, it could not do, she lost faith in it, and began to ascribe falsehood, intentional deceit and evil motives to her Maker. She said in her heart: We shall not die at all by eating of the fruit of this tree. God has deceived us with malignant intent to hold us in slavish dependence upon himself, and in subjection to His arbitrary will. For here in the fruit of this beautiful tree, as its name indicates, and as God knew when He prohibited it, there is contained such a potent virtue that, as soon as we shall eat of it, our eyes shall be opened, and we shall become equal to God in our ability to discern and choose between good and evil for ourselves by our own wisdom. Thus we shall obtain complete emancipation from our blind dependence upon the authority of God's laws, which render no reasons for their commands or prohibitions, but only thunder death to the transgressor. Here, then, the light of faith in God, by which hitherto she had seen all things through His eyes, so to speak, went out, and dark, horrible, Godless unbelief entered, by which she was thrown back upon her own short-sighted and erring wisdom for the guidance of her life.

VI

THE ORIGINAL SIN

And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make her wise, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat, and she gave also to her husband with her, and he did eat.

THE bosom sin which had already been generated in the heart of our first mother under the subtle temptation of the adversary could not fail to go forth and consummate itself in the corresponding outward act of transgression. For her sense of sight was now captivated by the beauty of the tree loaded with its ripe fruit. Her sense of taste also was excited by the anticipated pleasure of eating what she thought must be more delicious food than any she had ever tasted. And for these gratifications of her earthly and sensual nature, she was now ready to cast off finally and forever the wisdom and commands of God as the guide and law of her life. But, above all, the tree was one to be desired to make her wise, in what sense we have already seen. For by the potent virtue of its fruit, she would obtain, as she had been deluded to believe, an intelligent and unerring insight into the nature of good and evil, so that she could choose between them for herself by her own wisdom. And, oh, how blessed and glorious would it be for her thus to achieve complete deliverance from the necessity of walking and living by faith in another, even though that other were God himself, and to secure forever an independent and infallible wisdom and way and will of her own! How delightful to walk and live by sight, instead of by faith, and yet never err from

the path of her own welfare and happiness! She hesitated no longer:

> Her rash hand in evil hour
> Forth reaching to the fruit, she plucked, she ate.
> Earth felt the wound, and nature from her seat
> Sighing through all her works, gave signs of woe,
> That all was lost.

Thus the will in the mother of mankind, the centre and substance of her personality, turned away its face finally from the authoritative wisdom of God, and yielding to the solicitations, put itself under the law, of her earthly and sensual nature. For in the very act of disobedience, she chose what seemed good in her own eyes, and rejected what had been marked as good for her by the command of God. Thus she consummated her bosom sin of questioning doubt and unbelief.

The sin of the woman was immediately reflected and reproduced in her husband. St. Paul, indeed, informs us that "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." His meaning may be no more than that he was not *first* deceived, and that she was *first* in the transgression. Or it may be that the understanding of the man was not imposed upon by the sophism which was employed by the tempter, and which, in the light of the preceding discussion, it is easy to detect and characterize. For it was what is called in logic the *petitio principii*, or begging the question, in which the conclusion to be proved is covertly assumed. This becomes evident when we consider that the tempter, in proposing to the woman the ability to discriminate between good and evil as the benefit which she would obtain by eating of the forbidden tree, admitted that this was a power which she did not then possess. But he carefully slurred over the point, that, in the very act of eating contrary to the Divine command, she must necessarily choose by her own wisdom, as

if she were already in possession of this power: in other words, in order to obtain what she desired, she must act upon the assumption that she already possessed it. Now it may be that Adam was not deceived by this transparent sophism, and did not anticipate any such result from eating of the forbidden tree, but followed his wife in the transgression from the strength of connubial affection, because he could not bear to separate his destiny from hers. This was Milton's understanding of the transaction:

> He scrupled not to eat,
> Against his better knowledge; not deceived,
> But fondly overcome with female charm.
> Earth trembled . . . and nature gave a second groan,
> Sky lowered, and, muttering thunder, some sad drops
> Wept at completing of the mortal sin
> Original.

However this may be, it is certain that the sin of the man was the same in substance with that of the woman, as it was consummated in the same outward act. For in eating of the forbidden tree, she chose between good and evil by the light and wisdom of her earthly nature; and it was by this nature that he was united to her in marriage, as appears from the emphasis placed upon the words, "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. ... They twain shall be one flesh," as, also, from the fact, that this union is dissolved by death, so that the survivor is at liberty to contract another marriage. Adam, therefore, in allowing himself to be led by the suggestions and influence of his wife to transgress the Divine command, yielded to the solicitations, and followed the guidance, of the same earthly nature in him. Thus his will, also, the centre and heart of his personality, turned its face away from the oracle of God, and put itself in subjection to his earthly and carnal nature.

Thus it was, as here represented, that, by eating of the forbidden tree, and by the states of mind and heart therein

implied, man ceased to recognize himself as an image of God, and ceased to reflect God's distinctions between good and evil. Thus he lost faith in God—in His truth, goodness, love and wisdom—and charged his Maker with deceit and malice. He ceased to prefer the wisdom and will of God to his own, and set up the light of his earthly nature as his criterion and law of discernment and choice between good and evil. Thus he repudiated the authority of God over him and undertook to be a God to himself. He said in his heart, as the tempter had said before, "I will be like the Most High." And he carried his sin to the utmost extreme of impiety by profaning the holy sacrament which his Heavenly Father had set up in the bosom of his daily life to nourish and develop his spiritual nature, and as the safeguard of his innocence and happiness. He sinned as the beloved disciple would have done, if, whilst he leaned upon the bosom of his Lord, instead of receiving the offered bread and wine, he had dashed them upon the ground, and trampled them under his feet.

Thus the mind in man became "the carnal mind," and his will "the will of the flesh." Thus the mind and will of the flesh now became the criterion of his discernment and choice between good and evil—the supreme law of his life. If, now, by the insight and reasonings of his own creature wisdom, he could not comprehend the reasons upon which God's commands were grounded, he would not submit to them, nor obey them. If he could not see how a thing would be good for him, or what good would result from it, he would not choose nor do it simply for the reason that it was marked as good and commanded by the wisdom and authority of God. If he could not see how a thing would be evil for him, or what evil would result from it, he would not eschew it simply because it was stigmatized as evil and forbidden by the wisdom and authority of God. Thus, also, man became immersed in the world of illusion—became 'subject to vanity.' For looking now

at all things through the eyes of his earthly nature—of that wisdom which gave all its practical judgments from the earthly point of view—he could see nothing but earthly and perishable things. He lost perception of the unreal and shadowy nature of the phantoms of time and sense The things which are invisible and spiritual, which only have substantial and eternal reality, became dim and shadowy and uncertain ; truth and error were involved in indistinguishable confusion. He was baptized into the great Satanic lie, by which the things of God have ever since been perverted—into the image of the father of lies. Viewed under the figure previously assumed, the will in man now became self-will, and, leaving the steward's office in this house of God, he entered the sacred chamber of the Divine presence, and seated himself upon God's altar and throne ; whence he began to issue his authoritative mandates to the household, as if he had been the conscience itself. Thus the chamber of knowledge became filled with doleful errors, delusions and chimeras ; the chamber of the affections with inordinate desires, unclean and monstrous passions ; and, in the outer hall of sensation, the appetites became as swine in their stye.

It will be observed that, in this representation of the first sin, no attempt is made at a philosophical explanation of the origin of evil ; and that, for the best of reasons. For how it was possible for a holy nature to pass out of its original holiness into sin, is, and must forever remain, a mystery inscrutable to our minds. In order to comprehend it, we must be able to discern the primal natures or essences of good and evil, which, as we have seen, is impossible to all finite intelligence. Consequently, for every creature that God has made, the origin of evil is an eternally insoluble problem. Indeed, it has been well observed by Neander that " to explain evil is to justify it." The demonstration which has been given of the impossibility of the quadrature of the circle is not a whit more

conclusive than that which might be given of the insolubility of this problem. The principal difference is, that, by the aid of the symbols employed in mathematical analysis, the logic in the one case is more easily mastered than in that of the other. Happy are they, beset with a speculative mind, who learn this, and cease to vex themselves with a question by which they must be eternally baffled.

Now, in confirmation of the preceding views, we would be happy indeed, if we could refer to all the ablest interpreters of Scripture who have ever treated of the subject. It must be conceded, however, that this cannot be done. For, in a somewhat extensive course of reading with this object in view, we have been able to discover but one author whose authority can be fairly cited ; but he, as all will admit, was one of the greatest minds the world has ever seen, namely, Lord Bacon, the father of modern science. In his various writings, he frequently alludes to the Scriptural account of the fall, showing that he had made it a special study, and always in the sense of the following quotations : "Man, when he was tempted, before he fell, had offered unto him this suggestion, that he should be like God : but how ? not simply, but in this part, knowing good and evil. . . It was an aspiring desire in man to attain to the proud knowledge which defineth of good and evil, with an intent to depend no more upon the commandments and prohibitions of God, but upon himself and his own light, and to give law unto himself as a god, which was the original temptation."* Here we have the whole matter in a nutshell, from which no one can fail to see that it was understood by this great man precisely as it has now been explained. But such confirmation is hardly needed. For we have abundant evidence, in addition to that which appears on its face, of the soundness of this interpretation, in the flood of light which it pours

* The latter of these quotations is taken from two passages in Lord Bacon's Works, Vol. I, pp. 82, 162.

upon the nature of sin, upon the way of salvation by faith, and, indeed, upon the whole subsequent revelation. To these points we must now give some brief attention.

Here, then, in this first transgression we have set forth in symbol or diagram the primal root and inmost essence of all sin, as consisting in the aspiration and attempt of the creature to possess and to exercise that incommunicable attribute and power of God by which He alone is able to discern and choose between good and evil by His own wisdom. But this aspiration in man must not be limited to the self-conscious operations of his mind. For the children of Adam, being propagated subsequently to his sin and fall, are born, as it would seem, in his moral likeness, with a moral nature out of which there springs up spontaneously, as poison under the serpent's tongue, the preference of their own wisdom and will, of what seems good in their own eyes, to the wisdom and will of God, to what is good in his sight. This inherited self-conceit, self-trust, self-assertion is the original corruption or pravity of man's spiritual nature, and the substance, principle and root of that which in form, development and growth, becomes in all men that self-conscious and active preference of their own wisdom and will to the wisdom and will of God in which all sin consists.

There is, however, as from the symbolical character of this whole record we might anticipate, a beautiful similitude or reflection of paradisiac innocence in the infancy and childhood of human beings, which has been characterised by Lord Bacon as "the sparkle of the purity of man's first estate." For during this period the Adam is yet undeveloped. The infant knows nothing of right or wrong, good or evil. By his own voluntary act he has not yet eaten of the forbidden tree—has not yet assumed to be a law unto himself. With instinctive and implicit faith he still hangs upon his mother, and feels himself to be safe and happy in her arms. In the most charming

similitude of innocence he now dwells in paradise, free from shame, toil and sorrow, where all his wants are supplied without his foresight or care, where all nature blooms out on his opening senses, and where every sense is filled with delight. In this state, he is one of those little ones of whom St. Paul tells us that they "have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," and concerning whom our Lord declares that "of such is the kingdom of heaven."

But, in the natural development of every human child, apart from grace, there comes a time when he begins to question the wisdom and authority of his parents as the law of distinction between good and evil for him, and to assert a wisdom and choice and will of his own. Unconsciously at first, consciously afterwards, his questionings spontaneously arise: Is not this food, or this amusement, or this mode of dress good for him—adapted to give him pleasure? He can see no harm in it. Why, then, is it prohibited? He can see no reason for it. For, being ignorant of what his parents know of good and evil, because he is without their experience, it seems to him that their commands and prohibitions are not based upon good and sufficient reasons; consequently that it is harsh and arbitrary in them to hold him under an authority which will not condescend to justify itself in his eyes. And, now, having begun to question and doubt the wisdom and love of his parents, he is ready to impute to them unworthy motives: They love to govern him; they take pleasure in making him do what is disagreeable and irksome. Thus he sets up his own wisdom and will against theirs as his law of distinction and choice between good and evil; thus he begins to eat of the forbidden tree. Nor let it be supposed that such mental processes are too subtle for the minds of very young children; for although they may not come up into clear consciousness, nor find expression in words, yet the substance of all this must

evidently be in every child before he can proceed to any outward act of disobedience.

In the meantime, the law of God has made its appearance in the consciousness of the child, commanding and forbidding with the voice of absolute authority, *i. e.*, without any explanation of the reasons upon which its mysterious distinctions are grounded. Whence this new law and authority over him who has already lost faith in, and cast off that of his parents? He does not believe in it. Because he cannot know what God knows concerning good and evil, nor comprehend the infinite series of effects and consequences which will flow from his actions, he will not believe that the things which God commands or forbids are good or evil for him. Hence he disobeys and rebels. He will follow his own judgment in choosing between good and evil. In this way, that which has already taken place in respect to his parents and their law, naturally repeats itself in respect to God and His law; that in him which has already asserted independence of the authority of his parents now asserts for itself independence of the authority of God. Thus he sets up his own wisdom and will against the wisdom and will of God as his guide and law of distinction and choice between good and evil, and thereby perfects his transgression of eating of the forbidden tree. Neither shall he die at all. He fully believes that he is competent to walk by his own light, to be a law unto himself. Consciously or unconsciously, in spirit, if not in processes of thought, in substance, if not in the precise forms here represented, all this must precede every known and voluntary transgression of the Divine law.

More deadly still does all this become when the length and breadth and searching spirituality of this law is revealed to the sinner. When he learns that it forbids, not only outward acts, but also appetites, desires and other affections, the most secret thoughts, dispositions of heart, and states of mind, what he has long felt and now loves

to feel, and what does not seem to be subject to his own control—and these, under the direst penalties, "the worm that never dies," and "the fire that never shall be quenched,"—then, apart from grace, it naturally seems to him that God deals with him in the most tyrannical and cruel manner. What! has He created me with these desires, and will He damn me because they burn? He has given me reason, and forbids me to use it! He commands me to exercise faith and love towards Him when faith and love are not in my own power! Here the carnal mind becomes enmity against God. The sinner would dethrone God if he could. The law in its spirituality and power awakens into life and activity the sin [*ἁμαρτία*] which before lay dead, or comparatively inactive in his soul, and he dies the death in trespasses and sins. We have here the meaning of those words of St. Paul which have been so much misunderstood: "I was alive once without the law; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. . . For without the law sin was dead. . . The strength of sin is the law."

It is true, indeed, that the faith of Christ in the parents, and working through them in a thousand effectual ways upon their children, does often restrain the Adamic nature from rushing into such wild excess, even where the children are not the subjects of regenerating and sanctifying grace. To many, also, even in Christian countries, the Divine law never comes with such revelation of its spiritual exactions as to call into full activity this slumbering enmity against God; and, with respect to the heathen, being without the law, except as an uncertain and confused echo of it may be heard in their consciences, they cannot come under its unmitigated condemnation. But the root or germ of all this is in every child of Adam; and it is in consequence of this that 'death reigns over all, even those who know not the law, and have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.'

Not unfrequently, however, the development of the Adam in children is facilitated and hastened, rather than repressed, by parental treatment and influence. For whilst the child hangs upon his parents in conscious dependence and instinctive faith, they are to him in the place of God, and his filial subjection and obedience to them are ordained to educate and prepare him for filial subjection and obedience to his Heavenly Father. The grand object of the parental law and authority is, that it may prefigure and usher in the law of God, as springing from His incomprehensible wisdom and unfathomable love, and as representing His authority. When it fails to serve this purpose it is an utter failure. Consequently no pains should be spared to train up the child in the obedience of implicit faith and filial love, as opposed to that of sight and reasoning. By all possible means, his mind should be imbued with the conviction that his own wisdom can never be an adequate or safe guide for him to follow in the distinction and choice between good and evil, and that he must ever be implicitly submissive and obedient to an authority above him, the reasons of whose commands and prohibitions he can never comprehend, whose wisdom and love he must never question or doubt, and that thus only can it be well with him, either in this life or in that which is to come. And when the spirit of questioning and disobedience begins to manifest itself, the parents, as we see in this record of the original sin, ought simply and affectionately, yet with all solemnity and emphasis, to reaffirm their commands, but by no means to attempt any explanation of the reasons upon which they are grounded. For the best reason, and perhaps the only one that should ever be given, for a child's obedience, is, that his parents, in the superiority of their wisdom, in the fulness of their love, and in the plenitude of their authority, have given him a command. Yet he should be subject to the fewest possible restraints. He should have the free range of his

native paradise. And every command should be given with the gentlest voice and manner, in the fewest and simplest words. But for every transgression of a known command, and for nothing else, chastisement should be administered with all tenderness, yet with unswerving fidelity. This is the wisdom of God for the training of children; and woe to the age and world which have found for themselves another wisdom!

But instead of this, nothing is more common than for parents to argue with their children, endeavoring to make them comprehend the reasons for which they are required to do anything, that they may be led to see that it is good, and may choose it for themselves. Now this is to assume the truth of the original Satanic lie, that, if the matter be properly explained to them, they are capable of discerning and choosing between good and evil by their own wisdom. For the wisdom of the parent can no more justify itself to the child's mind than the wisdom of God could justify itself to the minds of His first human children. Hence, whenever such an appeal is made to the reason or judgment of the child to sanction a parental command, that judgment, if it be honest, is always liable to go against the command; in which case, the parent is reduced to the necessity, either of allowing the child to do as he pleases, or of flying from the judgment to which he himself has appealed. Often parents are amazed and confounded at what seems to them the stupidity or perverseness of their children, because, after the matter has been fully explained to them, they are not at all convinced, but desire to do what is forbidden just as much as before. But the stupidity is in the parents: woe to them, and unto their children, and unto their children's children, to the third and fourth generation, that it is! For thus they stand to their children in the place of the original tempter. They lead them up to the forbidden tree, show them its fruit, so fair to the eye and good for food, and so desirable to make

them wise, and invite them to pluck and eat—to do that which expels them from their beautiful paradise of simplicity, innocence and happiness, and sends them forth into a world full of thorns and thistles—to do that which works death in their souls. For when the law of God, which cannot give its reasons, comes to the child, it finds him already trained to regard his own wisdom as adequate to his discernment between good and evil; it finds him already in rebellion against the authority of the law. Alas for the child! Through the influence of his parents, he has sinned and fallen before he has come to know that there is any right or wrong, or any God. And 'woe unto the world because of the offences which are thus committed against the Lord's little ones!'

The view which has now been presented of the genesis, nature and propagation of sin is further and strongly confirmed by the flood of light which it pours upon the whole subsequent Scripture. Of this, however, we can give here only a few examples.

Here, then, in the first place, we see why such vast importance was attached to parental authority and training in the covenant which God made with Abraham, in which it was the prescribed means for the realization and fulfilment of the covenant promises. We have this stated in the words of God as follows: "For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him." Also, this view enables us to comprehend the deep significance which is everywhere in the Word ascribed to disobedience of parents, namely, because it is the first stage in the development of the original sin; because it is rebellion against God in germ. For this reason, in the decalogue, it is classed with idolatry, adultery and murder, and prohibited, with the promise of long life to filial reverence and obedience: and

hence, when it became incorrigible, it was punished, under the Mosaic law, with death by stoning.

Again, we have here exhibited in a new light the nature, object and necessity of the moral law, as revealed in the Scriptures. For in this law God sets forth His distinctions between what is good and what is evil for man. He does not make anything either good or evil by simply commanding or forbidding it. In the moral law, as distinguished from positive and temporary enactments, He commands only what is good in itself, was good before, and would have been good, if He had never commanded it. He forbids nothing but what is evil in itself, was evil before, and would have been evil, if He had never forbidden it. Now this 'holy and just and good law,' having been originally written upon the heart of man, was necessarily defaced and obscured by sin, so that his conscience no longer gave forth its oracles of distinction between good and evil with its former certainty, fulness and authority. In man's fallen state, the clamor of rebellious appetite and passion confuses the voice of God in his soul, so that he is ever liable to mistake evil for good, and good for evil. Hence, in order that salvation from sin should be possible, a necessity arose that God should reveal the moral law in a new and absolutely perfect outward form, that by its distinctions everything claiming to be a deliverance of the conscience might be tested, and that so an infallible direction and guidance for human life might be recovered.

Moreover, we see here why sincere obedience to the law of God, or true piety, is everywhere in the Word identified with wisdom, and sin with folly—why the good man is always the wise man, and the sinner a fool. For even the worst of sins—idolatry, incest and murder—are characterised as foolishness, and no more criminal charge is ever brought against any man than that "he hath wrought folly in Israel." And the reason of this becomes evident, when we consider that wisdom, properly defined, is the practical

choice of that which is good for the chooser himself; and folly, similarly defined, is the practical choice of that which is evil for the chooser himself: when we consider, also, that, for the choice of good, and the eschewing of evil, the wisdom of God is the only infallible criterion and guide. Hence it follows, that he who governs himself by this wisdom chooses what is good for himself, and he who departs from it, and puts himself under the guidance of his own wisdom, chooses, of necessity, what does harm to himself. Now this identification between piety and wisdom, and between sin and folly, stands out in the whole word of God, and is the general theme of the book of Proverbs, running through all the amazing variety of its sacred apothegms, as a golden thread through a necklace of pearls; nor is it possible fully to appreciate any one of them without reference to this leading idea which gives unity to them all. Thus, in the first chapter and elsewhere, with almost endless repetition: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning [literally, the principle] of knowledge ... The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge of the holy is understanding. ... Be not wise in thine own eyes ... Lean not to thine own understanding ... Fools despise wisdom and instruction ... The prosperity of fools shall destroy them ... They lay wait for their own blood; they lurk privily for their own lives." This identification is found, also, upon the old Egyptian monuments, in the hieroglyphical records of that wisdom in which Moses was educated, and which probably was derived from a primitive revelation; for there the sign which is always translated "the wicked" is that of a man breaking his own head with an axe. In like manner, sin is identified with pride, and piety with humility, or meekness, which commonly signifies that state of mind which is submissive and obedient to the Divine commands; and it is in this sense we are to understand the words: "The meek shall inherit

the land," and those in which it is said that "the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth." On the other hand, "the proud" and "scorners" invariably signify the disobedient, the wicked. The reason of all this is, that the pious have not, and the wicked have, such a proud conceit of their own wisdom, as a sufficient guide and law of distinction between good and evil, that the former do, and the latter do not, humble themselves to believe in, and submit to, the distinction which God gives them in his authoritative commands and prohibitions.

In fine, we see here why it is that, in God's way of salvation, everything is made to turn upon faith. For Scriptural faith necessarily implies in man the renunciation of his own wisdom as folly—of what seems good in his own eyes—and the adoption in its place of the wisdom of God —of what is good in His sight—as this is revealed in Christ. He who truly believes receives Christ as the Lord of his reason, affections and will, of his heart and conscience, of his whole life. By this faith he is assured that all things are as Christ represents them; that what He commands is good, and only good, and what He forbids is evil, and only evil, for himself and all mankind. The question of all truth for him is, not what he thinks, but what Christ thinks. The question of all practical conduct is, not what seems good or evil to him—not what he approves or disapproves, desires or does not desire—but, simply, what his Lord has commanded or forbidden. And, by the same principle, his heart is governed in all his relations to the Divine providence; so that, according to the strength of his faith, he has no mind or will of his own; in their place to him are the mind and will of his Lord. He no longer judges of anything by his own wisdom, which he recognizes as perfect folly, but looks at all things, so to speak, through the eyes of his Lord, whose wisdom he cordially receives as the supreme law of his discernment

and choice between good and evil. With his Lord's reasons, whether in the requirements of the law, the obligations of grace, or the dispensations of Providence, he instinctively feels that he has nothing to do; that his whole duty is that of filial submission and obedience; in which he enjoys the sweetest assurance that all things shall be made to work together for his good. Thus the words of St. Paul are fulfilled in him: "If any man thinketh himself to be wise, let him become a fool that he may be wise:" and those other words by the prophet concerning the Lord himself: "Who is blind as my Servant? or deaf as my Messenger that I sent? Who is blind as He that is perfect? or blind as the Lord's Servant?... He shall not judge after the sight of His own eyes, nor reprove after the hearing of His own ears; but with righteousness shall He judge." Thus it is, and not otherwise, that man recovers what was lost in the fall.

It should be observed, in conclusion, that this view of the original sin is contained substantially in most of the traditions concerning it which have been preserved among the heathen. As a single example, according to the Greek mythology, the sin of the first man consisted in an attempt which he had made to ascend into heaven to steal the fire, *i. e.* the light or wisdom of the gods. For his punishment, a woman was created and bestowed upon him. She was endowed with every female perfection. Venus gave her beauty, with all irresistible attractions, and filled her heart with the desire of pleasing. The god of eloquence touched her lips with persuasion. Apollo taught her music. Minerva instructed her in all useful arts. The Hours and the Graces decked her with every winning ornament. Each of the deities conferred upon her some precious gift. Last of all, Zeus placed in her hand a mystical casket, enjoining upon her, under the most terrible penalties, never to open it. Thus endowed, she was presented to her husband. But, overcome in evil hour by the desire of forbid-

den knowledge, she broke the seal of the fatal casket, and forth flew from within all the cares, sorrows and maladies of human life. Too late she tried to close it, but in vain. Hope alone remained at the bottom, which she carefully preserved and handed down to her posterity, now all she had to leave them.* Dimmed and obscured, indeed, it is, yet it reflects the nature of the original sin. It is a far-off echo of the mournful truth, sounding across the abysm of ages, through the toil and sorrow and death which have universally prevailed, pitiful as the wail of the young mother over her dead child, not without the hope that, though it be dead, it shall live again.

* See Hesiod, *Theog.* 521, and *Opera et Dies*, 47.

VII

THE TEMPTER

Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. . . . And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field: upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her Seed. He shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise His heel.

ACCORDING to the bare literal sense of this record, the tempter of the first human beings was a serpent or snake, and nothing more. But this loathsome reptile is the chosen Scriptural symbol of the great spiritual adversary of God and man, as we find it elsewhere and in the words of St. John: "That old serpent which is the devil and Satan." Hence there is no room for doubt but that it was he who, under the form of a serpent, exercised the subtle malignity of his nature in the primal temptation. Nor does the curse subsequently pronounced upon the creature, as the instrument of Satan, imply that its form, motions, or habits were different before from what they have been ever since. For the judgment of labor upon man does not imply that he had previously lived in idleness. On the contrary, it is expressly stated that he was placed in the garden of Eden "to dress it and to keep it." Nor do the sorrows of parturition inflicted on the woman imply that in a state of innocence she would never have borne children. The more probable view of such matters is, that those conditions of nature

which otherwise would have been productive of no inconvenience, became punishments or chastisements in consequence of sin. We may reasonably understand, then, that it was the serpent, as we know it now, which was chosen by the tempter as his instrument for the purpose of reflecting his own moral character in place of the image of God in man. In this choice he may have been guided by his native subtlety, discerning that, of all creatures, this one constituted the most perfect symbol of himself; or, which is more probable, this whole transaction may have been overruled by the good providence of God for the instruction of mankind in all subsequent ages.

With respect to the subtlety which is here ascribed to the serpent, it belongs to the animal mind, that sensual wisdom with which the earthly nature, both in man and in the inferior creatures, is endowed. The most prominent characteristics of this earthly mind, are, as we have seen, that it is incapable of the distinction between right and wrong, and of the knowledge of the spiritual world, and that it gives all its practical judgments from the earthly point of view, solely for the gratification of the appetites, passions and other affections of the material nature at whose head it stands. In mere animals, however, it is not an evil, but a good. In fact, it is the supreme excellence of all those creatures which have no moral nature, unless instinct be placed above it. It is only when subtlety is predicated of moral beings that the word is used in a bad sense. We do not call him a subtle, crafty, or cunning person in whose character truth, justice, fidelity are the most prominent traits; in whom this calculating and selfish craft is held in subjection to the laws of moral obligation; whose prudential wisdom is informed, subdued and controlled by the authority of God's commands. This is not subtlety, but wisdom, in the Scriptural and noblest sense of the word. It is not a little strange, however, that of all animals, the serpent should be represented

as the most highly endowed with this sensual wisdom. But we know that mysterious attributes and powers have always and everywhere been ascribed to it, in consequence of which serpent-worship has prevailed, at one time or another, over nearly or quite the whole world; nor has it ever been satisfactorily explained how the creature has been able to make such a deep and universal impression upon the human mind. Perhaps, when science shall have solved this problem, there will be nothing surprising in the manner in which it is here characterized.

But we find other qualities and conditions in this reptile which, although apparently inconsistent, are, in fact, closely connected with the quality here ascribed to it. For it is the most gluttonous of all creatures. In the words of an eminent naturalist: "These frightful creatures are voracious above all others, and happy is it for mankind that their voracity is often their punishment;" for the nature of which this sensual wisdom is the head knows no law but the gratification of its own greedy appetites and passions. Also, the serpent grovels upon its belly, with its eyes nearly level with the ground, so that it can see only the shortest distance ahead: for subtlety is a grovelling quality, and ever short-sighted withal. The only far-sighted wisdom is that of instinct in animals, and that of conscience in man. Again, the serpent moves forwards to its object, not in a straight or direct line but by oblique, complicated and tortuous involutions and evolutions of its body; in allusion to which, as also to the preceding case, we have the following from Lord Bacon: "We take cunning to be a sinister or crooked wisdom.... These windings or crooked courses are the goings of the serpent, which goeth basely on the belly, and not on feet." Moreover, the serpent alone, of all creatures, has a double tongue, which, in all ages among all nations, has been taken as the most expressive symbol of malignant falsehood and deceit. In fine, in its typical species, its mouth

is full of deadly poison, which it ever seeks, by means of its fatal fangs, to inject into "the blood which is the life" of all other creatures. For it is the mortal enemy of everything that lives and breathes, especially of man, and naturally man is its enemy. The object of its worship, doubtless, has been to propitiate and avert its malignant power.

Such, then, was the creature in which the great spiritual adversary of God and man became incarnate, in order to effect his diabolical purpose, being led to make this choice, either by the overruling providence of God, or by his own subtlety, because he found in the form, motions, character and conditions of this reptile the only suitable and adequate symbol of his own fallen and ruined nature. And this symbol is full of instruction for all mankind. For it teaches us that the wisdom of Satan is subtlety: in other words, he does not hold himself in any wise amenable to the direct, straight, authoritative guidance of the wisdom of God—he has no conscience—but relies wholly upon his own prudential faculties to discriminate and choose between what is good and what is evil for himself. He is incapable of looking upwards with reverence to that which is above him—to anything that is true or pure or beautiful or holy. The only views which he can take of such things excite his enmity and malignity. He looks at all things solely from the earthly point of view, and reaches all his practical judgments by the tortuous involutions and evolutions of his own subtlety. He is of an infinitely base and grovelling nature, whose meat and drink it is to have his own selfish way, and to do his own malignant will—ravenous and greedy beyond conception for the gratification of the lowest, most filthy and abominable lusts; chief among which is his lust of torment—a raging desire to inflict suffering and misery upon all other creatures, into whose life he is ever seeking to inject that deadly poison of deceit and falsehood of which his

own mouth is full: "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for he is a liar and the father of it. . . . He was a murderer from the beginning." He wages implacable warfare against everything above him, especially against God and against God's image in man, under whose bruised heel he thereby places his own head to be crushed. Consequently, he is ever short-sighted. He overreaches himself in everything that he does, frustrates his own purposes and objects, and brings upon his own head the evil which he seeks to inflict upon others. He is wise only to do evil to others and to himself, which is the perfection of folly.

Here, then, we have symbolically represented the serpent-like character of the spiritual tempter of man; and these ideas are still further developed in the malediction pronounced upon the creature for its agency in the temptation, upon its seed, and upon the adversary who became incarnate in it in order to effect his diabolical object. In fact, this malediction must be interpreted as a Divine symbol of even more profound significance than any other of the series, inasmuch as it contains a glorious prophecy of the ultimate triumph of good over evil in this world, and a reference to the incarnation and sacrifice of the Lord, by which this triumph should be achieved. For as the serpent is the symbol of Satan, so the seed of the serpent represents Satan's image or likeness in man; and the Seed of the woman includes all her posterity with special reference to Him who was born of a virgin, and who suffered on the cross all the rage and malice of the adversary.

The serpent-like malice of Satan, together with the shortsighted folly of his wisdom or subtlety, are strikingly exhibited and copiously illustrated in his whole Scriptural history. For he was certainly prompted in his temptation of our first parents by his enmity against mankind, which enmity, it should be observed, did not originate from this

malediction; and his folly is exemplified in the fact, that he thereby brought himself under the wrath and curse of God, placed his own head under the heel of the Seed of the woman to be crushed, and opened the way for such revelations of the grace and whole character of God as otherwise would have been impossible. Thus he more than frustrated his own purposes and objects. Also, by his temptation of Job he succeeded only in perfecting the spiritual life of the patriarch, in promoting his more abundant temporal prosperity, and in furnishing the materials for a book of the most sublime revelations, which has been the source of unspeakable consolation to God's tempted and afflicted people, and of instruction in the mysteries of Divine providence, in all subsequent ages. In like manner, in his temptation of the great Seed of the woman, he suffered an ignominious defeat, and caused Him to pass through that experience which was indispensable to His perfection as a succorer and Savior of tempted and afflicted souls. Even in his greatest achievement, in which he tempted Judas to betray, and the Jews to crucify the Lord of glory, he made himself the instrument of exalting the object of his enmity above every creature, of placing the government of the universe upon His shoulder, and of laying the only foundation which could be laid for the salvation of mankind. Thus, where, doubtless, he thought he had obtained a final victory, he ensured the object which he aimed to defeat, and destroyed his own power. For Christ suffered "that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." We see the same thing in his persecutions of the primitive Christians, in which 'the blood of the martyrs became the seed of the church,' and in all other manifestations of his enmity against the Seed of the woman; and we shall yet see, as the final result, that 'he shall be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone,

where he shall be tormented day and night forever and ever—in everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels.'

But this powerful symbol represents, not only the curse of the adversary himself, but also that of his seed, the serpent in man. For it is in this sense that the Scribes and Pharisees are called a "generation of vipers," "children of the devil," and Elymas the sorcerer is addressed in the words: "O full of all subtlety and mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" In all the particulars in which the symbol characterizes Satan himself, it characterizes also his seed. For the head of the serpent in man is this same subtlety, which being essentially "earthly," as belonging to his animal nature, becomes, when exalted into the place of the wisdom of God as the guide and law of discernment between good and evil, both "sensual and devilish." It is true, indeed, that by the light of this wisdom man may attain to the knowledge of earthly things, and may possess himself of the perishable wealth of this world, but, when he falls wholly under it, the light of spiritual life in his soul goes out in Egyptian darkness, he becomes blind to spiritual things, and he loses the imperishable treasures of heaven. Speak to him now of the beauty or glory of meekness under insult, of love to his enemies, of returning good for evil, or of self-sacrifice in any form, and he knows not what you mean. Show him any one who follows the example of Christ, spending his time, wealth, strength, and perhaps his life for others' good, and all that he sees is a hypocrite, a fanatic, or a fool. Lead him to the cross of Calvary, and he will exclaim: "He saved others, himself He cannot save. . . . Let Him now come down from the cross, and we will believe." And if, in the last depths of this spiritual blindness, you speak to him of right and wrong, God or spirit, he will answer, as thousands are now doing: "I cannot see, nor

hear, nor feel, nor taste, nor smell God, nor spirit, nor right, nor wrong. "There is no God." He is a phantom of the imagination, created by fear. There is no right nor wrong but pleasure and pain. Thus, under the law of this serpentine wisdom, the spiritual nature of man loses its power to stand and walk uprightly, it falls over into a prone and crawling motion, with its face to the ground. On his belly the man goes, and eats dirt, all the days of his miserable life. He feeds upon the bread of deceit, envy, pride, vanity, lust and malignity. He is given over to a reprobate mind to work all uncleanness with greediness. Evil he calls good, and good evil. His mouth is full of cursing and bitterness. The poison of asps is under his tongue. Thus the image of God in man is replaced by the image of Satan.

But that which is most wonderful and prodigious in all this is the fierce enmity of the seed of the serpent against the Seed of the woman. For all history is full of it. Even before the Lord came into the world, His holy prophets and most devoted people "had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings.... They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword. They wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented.... Of whom the world was not worthy." When He appeared in all the transcendent beauty and glory of His person and character, clothed with immaculate innocence and purity, the fulness of His Divine life overflowing in streams of compassion and love for all mankind, how unspeakably shameful was the treatment He received! His stupendous miracles of benevolence and healing, which they could not deny, they ascribed to "Beëlzebub, the prince of the devils." Those whom He came to save reviled Him, spit upon Him, scourged Him, and finally crucified Him between two thieves. And His followers in the first ages—how were they treated? What is the meaning of the martyrology

of the church? What prompted a Roman emperor to light the public gardens with living Christians smeared over with pitch and set on fire? Whence the delight of the Roman populace when they beheld them torn in pieces by wild beasts in the amphitheatre? And these persecutions raged in different provinces of the civilized world, with brief intervals, for more than three centuries, during which, without exaggeration, millions of Christians, men, women and children, were tormented and murdered to feed the enmity of the serpent in man against the Seed of the woman. Nor has this enmity ever been appeased. In modern times, the great Frederick II of Prussia and the infidel Voltaire carried on a correspondence, in which they closed their letters to each other, as is well known, with the words, "Crush the wretch," meaning the Lord Jesus Christ. And what had He done to these mighty "sons of Belial" to draw upon himself their so fierce and deadly malignity? In like manner, the infidel philosophers of the last century put forth all their tremendous powers of argument, wit and sarcasm to destroy the Christian religion out of the world: equal malignity against it was manifested by the leading characters of the French revolution: to all which must be added, in our own times, the enmity of socialism, nihilism, and "science falsely so called." For with what motive do sceptical scientists take such pains to convince us that there is no God, or, if there be, that He cannot answer our prayers, nor come to our help, when we cry to Him in our distresses and sorrows? Why should they go out of their way and labor to deprive us of the hope of immortality; to persuade us that our souls perish with our mouldering bodies, and that we become as if we had never been? What interest can science possibly have in such horrible conclusions? Who can fail to recognize the animus by which all this is inspired? In the words of the Lord himself, "an enemy hath done this." It is all the quenchless enmity of the seed of the serpent against the Seed of the woman.

Thus we see how one part of this symbolical prophecy—the prediction that 'the serpent should bruise the heel of the Seed of the woman'—is fulfilled: not less striking is the fulfilment of the other part, that 'the Seed of the woman should crush the serpent's head.' For the whole history of Christ in the days of His flesh was a series of victories over His great enemy. Though frequently assailed by the most subtle and powerful temptations, He resisted and overcame them all, and lived a life of perfect innocence and holiness. All His miracles were wrought in destruction of the works of Satan—the fruits and consequences of sin. It is only from this point of view that we can rightly comprehend His mighty works of healing the most malignant and otherwise incurable diseases, opening the eyes of the blind, unstopping the ears of the deaf, causing the lame to walk, casting out devils, and raising the dead. For in an unfallen world, there surely had been no place for such phenomena. And, as the Life itself, He rose from under the power of death, after all that was mortal in Him had been "crucified, dead and buried," whereby He brought up out of the dark and loathsome grave light, life and immortality for all His people. 'Through death He destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.' From His sacrificial death, inflicted upon him by the enmity of Satan and his seed, have flowed to mankind all the blessings of the Christian religion. Upon the cross 'He spoiled all the principalities and powers of evil, and made them a spectacle of mockery for the folly of their wisdom, openly triumphing over them in it.' And hardly less signal was His triumph over them in their persecutions of the primitive church, when the patience and constancy of her innumerable martyrs drew the attention of all mankind, and exerted an overwhelming influence to convince them that such faith and patience must be truly Divine."

These examples of the crushing of the serpent's head, in which his wisdom is shown to be the perfection of folly,

his greatest successes to be his greatest defeats, accomplishing the very objects which he labors to frustrate, saving those whom he plots to destroy, are such as to awaken in all rational souls the most confident assurance and expectation that everything else in which he is permitted to bruise the heel of the Seed of the woman will further contribute to the final destruction of his power. Thus, doubtless, his present work in the Roman apostasy, denying the word of God to the people, prohibiting lawful marriage to the clergy, dogmatizing the infallibility of the pope, and the immaculate conception of the virgin mother of the Lord, and setting her up as an idol goddess and mediatrix between Christ and human souls—doubtless all this horrible impiety shall be overruled for good, and Satan's wisdom in it be made to appear as folly, no less than in his crucifixion of the Lord, and his persecutions of the martyr-church. Thus, also, the assaults of modern scepticism, though they be not joyous for the present, but very grievous—distressing ofttimes to sincere souls as the Master's death to his first disciples—yet is it no great stretch of faith to believe that they shall be made the means of establishing more firmly than ever the great truths which they call in question or deny; namely, that there is a God, that He has revealed himself to us in the Holy Scriptures, that He is our Heavenly Father, that He hears and answers our prayers, that Christ, by His holy sacrifice, has redeemed us from sin, death and hell, and that all who believe in Him shall be saved. The faith of these mighty truths shall surely come forth from all these conflicts as gold tried in the furnace. And as it appears that serpent-worship, in order to propitiate the powers of evil, has prevailed over the whole world, so "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." Not until then shall we understand the full significance of this grand symbolic prophecy, that 'the Seed of the woman shall crush the serpent's head.'

VIII

FIG-LEAVES

And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked, and they sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons. And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God in the midst of the trees of the garden. And the Lord God called unto Adam and said, Where art thou? And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked, and I hid myself. And he said, Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat? And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat. And the Lord God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me [caused me to forget] and I did eat.

THE views of the original sin which have been given we find confirmed and illustrated, not only in the curse upon the serpent, but also in all the other transactions which are recorded as immediately following the transgression, and which are to be interpreted as symbols precisely similar to those which have been already analyzed.

The first of these is that of the shame of the naked body which arose and manifested itself in our first parents after they had sinned. For in their estate of innocence, as we are significantly informed, "they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed;" and this, no doubt, because there was nothing in their spiritual nature of which they needed to feel ashamed in the presence of God. Their nakedness without shame was the appropriate and expressive image and symbol of their

childlike innocence. For in early childhood this peculiar sentiment does not manifest itself, and in all art innocence is represented by a nude figure. But, now, as the first consequence of their having eaten of the forbidden tree, from which they had anticipated that their eyes would be opened to discern between good and evil by their own wisdom, their eyes were opened, indeed, but in a very different sense, so that they immediately became aware of the shame of their nakedness. Here, then, we have this peculiar shame in man accounted for by referring it to sin as its cause: and, perhaps, in the whole range of literature, ancient and modern, sacred and profane, there is no other attempt, which is worthy of attention, to explain the origin of this mysterious sentiment, although it is certainly one of the most striking and wonderful of all the phenomena of human life.

This explanation, however, requires that we should take into account the two-fold nature of man, as composed of soul and body, in virtue of which our inward and spiritual experiences naturally seek for themselves some outward expression through the bodily organism. Pent up feelings seem to stifle us. In fact, human language itself must be conceived of as originating from this vital union between soul and body, in consequence of which whatever lives and moves in our spiritual nature demands and must find some outward manifestation through the physical organism. And so strong is this inborn tendency that it is not satisfied with mere words; it resorts also to the language of symbols. Our inward emotions, acting upon our bodies, instinctively and often involuntarily produce their corresponding and appropriate signs whereby they express themselves. Such symbolical and significant signs are the smile, the frown, the outcry, laughter and tears.

Now, when these first sinners experienced no such effects as they had been led to anticipate from their eating of the forbidden tree, but perceived, on the contrary, that they

had been deceived and betrayed to commit an act of stupendous folly and sin, whereby they had brought themselves under the displeasure and wrath of God, they became conscious of inward and spiritual shame—the shame of sin and guilt. This, of course, was a new and strange feeling. Consequently, and because it was in the strongest contrast with the peace and joy of their former innocence, their consciences not having been seared by repeated transgressions, it must have been fraught with heart-piercing anguish beyond all that we can conceive. How unspeakably awful must have been the first experience of remorse in the human soul! Hence it could not fail to seek and find some new and appropriate sign or symbolical manifestation. Pent up in their bosoms, it will stifle them. And how shall it manifest itself? It will surely find its own appropriate and significant expression, just as pleasure produces its smile, displeasure its frown, amusement its laughter, and sorrow its tears. Hence, as their pure bodies have hitherto been the most expressive symbol of their inward purity, so, now that their souls are defiled and polluted, the sight of their utter nakedness, vividly reminding them of their lost innocence and bliss, cannot fail to add the most distressing poignancy to their shame for their sin and folly. In addition to this, as they have been betrayed into sin by following the wisdom of their earthly and sensual nature, of which nature their naked material bodies are the most tangible and visible representation, they can no longer bear the sight of them, but must try, in some poor way, to cover them from their own, and from the eyes of God. Thus we may understand how it was that the inward and spiritual shame of sin, when it arose in the hearts of our first parents as a new and strange feeling, went forth, so to speak, and symbolized itself in the shame of their naked bodies, and in their attempt to cover them.

But why, we must ask, did this peculiar shame attach

itself most strongly to those parts of the body which an apron or girdle would cover? This will not seem strange if we consider that in those parts, above all others, the life, strength and lawlessness of the earthly and sensual nature, by which man was betrayed into sin, are summed up and concentrated. Hence they are the chosen Scriptural type of this nature, as appears from the fact, among many others, that the sins of drunkenness, gluttony, and other excesses of the sensual affections, are not prohibited by name in the decalogue, but under this type, in the commandment: "Thou shalt not commit adultery." This point will be further illustrated in the sequel. For this reason it was, no doubt, that the new and strong sentiment of spiritual shame for sin, when it sought an outward expression, and reflected itself in the shame of the naked body, naturally and spontaneously attached itself most strongly, though by no means exclusively, to those parts of the body which an apron or girdle would cover.

This explanation of the shame of the naked body in man is confirmed by the fact, that it does not appear in mere animals, nor in young children, and only in a feeble form among savages. For animals have only one nature, and this is in harmony with itself; they have no moral nature which can suffer degradation by subjection to their earthly and sensual life; hence they are incapable of sin and shame. In young children, the moral nature is yet undeveloped. The voice of God has not yet made itself heard in their consciences distinguishing between right and wrong, good and evil. 'The commandment has not yet come to them, and they have not yet sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.' Hence they have no shame of sin, nor of their naked bodies, which are the appropriate and beautiful symbol of their as yet paradisiac simplicity and innocence. But as soon as the moral law begins to enunciate itself in their consciences, and their sin against it becomes clearly defined and conscious, the

shame of their naked bodies begins to manifest itself, as in the first sinners. With respect to savages, this sentiment is feeble and obscure because their moral nature is feebly developed, and they hear only a confused echo of the moral law in their consciences. But as soon as this law is made known to them, and they come to recognize themselves as sinners, their shame is felt, and they begin to cover themselves.

In fine, this explanation is conclusively established by the fact, that, in the subsequent Scriptures, as has been intimated, this peculiar shame is constantly assumed as the type and symbol of the spiritual shame of sin. Thus in the following and a thousand similar expressions: "Thy nakedness shall be uncovered, yea, thy shame shall be seen . . . I will discover thy skirts upon thy face, that thy shame may appear." In fact, shame is the proper and Scriptural word to express the feeling of conscious guilt. It is altogether preferable to the heathen word remorse, because it implies the presence of Him against whom sin is committed, and before whom the conscious sinner feels ashamed, whilst remorse, which signifies the biting-back of sin into the soul, *i. e.*, the sting which it inflicts, leaves Him out of view. Hence the form in which the prophet makes confession of his own and the sins of his people: "I am ashamed and blush to lift up my face to thee my God, for our iniquities are increased over our heads, and our trespass has grown up unto the heavens."

Modesty, then, as we are here instructed, is a Divine symbol of sacramental significance, to nourish the shame of sin from which it proceeds in human souls. It is strongest in woman, perhaps, because she was first in the transgression, and for other far stronger reasons which will be referred to when we come to consider the influence of her peculiar chastisement, under which she has become more pure in heart than is man. Its symbolical character is universally recognized, as when we say of any one who has

cast off all moral restraint, that he is a shameless person. For in those who are thus 'given over to their own heart's lusts, to work all uncleanness with greediness,' so that they no longer feel the shame of sin, the shame of the naked body tends to perish with it. Not infrequently they are restrained from the exposure of their persons in public, and from open gratification of their brutal lusts, chiefly by their former habits, or by the customs of society, or by the penalties of human laws; and sometimes all these are ineffectual. It is against such that God himself brings the awful accusation: "Thou hast a whore's forehead, and refusest to be ashamed." Whenever, therefore, a willingness to uncover the body in public manifests itself among those who have the knowledge of the moral law, especially in women, it is an infallible sign of great corruption of morals—the symbol perishing together with the sacred sentiment which it is ordained to represent, quicken and nourish in human souls.

In further explanation of this complex symbol, it may be observed, that it is not expressly stated whether God manifested himself to these first sinners in a visible form, nor whether they heard His voice with their outward ears, or only with the ears of their souls. In any case, they recognized His presence, and it was truly His voice which reached their consciences, and awakened their shame and fear. The expression, "in the cool of the day," if that rendering be retained, may be intended to symbolize, that it was in a state of cool reflection, after the excitement and disturbance caused by their temptation and sin had subsided, they heard His voice in the garden. Literally rendered, however, it was "in the wind of the day" that this occurred. Now the wind is the Scriptural symbol of the Spirit of God, with special reference to His invisible and inscrutable operations in the human soul, as in the words of our Lord to Nicodemus: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not

tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." In fact, the word here is the same which is properly rendered "Spirit," where it is said: "The Spirit of God moved [brooded] upon the face of the waters." Hence it may be that Adam heard the voice of the Holy Spirit in his conscience, calling him to account and judging him for his sin, in so sensible a manner that he seemed to hear it also in the rustling of the wind among the branches of the trees, thus taking the symbol for the thing symbolized. If this were so, it would account for the mention of the wind in this connection, and the expression might be compared with Milton's weird and thrilling lines—such, at least, to every one who has had any experience of that which they describe:

> Those airy tongues that syllable men's names
> On shores and desert sands and wildernesses.

However that may be, the whole transaction is evidently one of symbolical and spiritual significance. For here we behold the first human sinners, in their first experience of the shame of sin and conscious nakedness, trying in vain to cover themselves with leaves strung together, and to hide themselves from the Divine presence among the trees of the garden: we hear the voice of God penetrating into the depth of their hiding place, and calling to them in words which thrill their hearts with the anguish of guilt and terror, "Man, where art thou?"—making inquisition for their sin, discovering the shame of it under the flimsy covering of excuses and subterfuges with which they fain would veil and cloak it, and pronouncing judgment upon their trembling souls: in all which, we have what has always been recognized as a most vivid picture from the pencil of God of sinful and fallen man.

For when the fleeting pleasure of sin has passed away, and the tumult which it produces in the sensitive nature and in the soul has subsided, the sinner who has not yet

become utterly hardened and abandoned feels degraded and ashamed. He is now conscious that there is something in him which cannot stand the scrutiny of the all-seeing eye. He hears also the voice of God in his conscience, judging, condemning him, and filling his soul with guilty terrors. Now he fain would hide himself from the awful presence. He tries to drown the accusing voice in the din of business, or the songs of pleasure—in the turmoil and clamor of the earthly and worldly life. But the voice follows him into his most secret hiding places, compels him to answer, and discovers his sin and shame. In vain he strives to hide it with excuses and palliations. He is conscious that the all-seeing eye pierces through all those attempts at self-justification, and he is compelled to stand naked, guilty and trembling in the presence of his Judge. Ah, how changed his condition from what it was in the innocence of childhood, when, unconscious of voluntary transgression, he knew neither shame nor fear!

The attempt of the first man to excuse himself by laying the blame upon his wife reveals the selfishness which his sin had introduced and established in his nature. For although he had been seduced by what bore the semblance of a generous sentiment towards her, since he preferred to share her fate, whatever it might be, even to retaining the favor of God for himself without her, yet, because he chose this in violation of the Divine command, the only criterion of what is truly generous and good, it has landed him in the heart of the most odious and loathsome selfishness and meanness. Therefore, let the blame of his sin rest upon her rather than upon himself: "She gave me of the tree, and I did eat." Poor girdle of fig-leaves—it cannot cover his shame!

The truth here symbolized is one of universal application. It is true that this selfishness of Adam is often sneered at by those who foolishly think that they would have felt and acted very differently. But such persons do

not appreciate the symbolical significance of this whole transaction, nor perceive that here, as elsewhere, the first man speaks and acts as representing all his posterity—in the character of sinful man. For, universally, that which may appear to man's wisdom as prompted by generous sentiments, even as an act of heroic self-sacrifice, if it be chosen in violation of the commands of God, will surely generate selfishness and meanness in the soul: or, rather, that essential selfishness towards God which is contained in every transgression of his holy and just and good law will surely manifest itself in the transgressor as selfishness towards his neighbor. This is the secret of that burning enmity which so often springs up between those who have been led into sin by the stress and passion of unlawful love, of which we have such a shocking example in Amon's hatred of his sister Tamar, and which otherwise seems to be so inexplicable. For when the voice of God in the conscience makes itself heard in judgment upon the sin, then all those sentiments which before seemed so full of tenderness and sweetness are turned into gall and wormwood, and the essential selfishness which was their heart and substance from the first is made to appear. The reason is, that man is necessarily incompetent to discern between good and evil by his own wisdom, and requires to have the distinction marked for him by the wisdom and authority of God.

Also, as here represented so universally, the sinner strives in vain to excuse himself by reasonings and devices of the carnal mind, in all which he lays the blame of his sins at last upon God. This is plainly the meaning of Adam's words: "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat." For conscious guilt is something too painful to bear. Hence, in order to silence the voice of the conscience within him, the sinner taxes his ingenuity to lay it upon some one else, or upon the circumstances in which he is placed—

upon his forefathers, the inherited corruption of his nature, the strength of his temptations, the necessities of business, and a thousand other things. But none of these excuses can possibly have the least validity or force; they are all devices of the carnal mind, and "refuges of lies which the overflowing scourge of God's judgment must sweep away." The whole blame of sin must lie upon the sinner himself, otherwise it would not be sin. This is further evident from the fact, that all the temptations to sin which ever can be brought to bear upon man are necessarily present to the mind of God when He gives him His commands; consequently, for everything which man can devise or think of to urge in self-justification or mitigation of his offences, God will always have an answer to this effect: I knew you would meet that temptation, and would have that reason for disobedience, when I gave you the command, and if I had seen that it was a good reason, I would not have given you the command. Moreover, if such excuses were valid as reasons for disobedience, they would convict God of giving unreasonable commands, and thus lay the blame of sin upon Him. For God, by his providence, is the author of all the circumstances in which man is, or ever can be placed, except those for which man himself is responsible. All this we have brought out with the utmost clearness in the parable which represents the man with one talent as excusing himself to his Lord in the following words: "I knew thee, that thou art a hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strewed, and I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth." Hence the just severity with which his Lord rebuked and punished him: "Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked servant. Thou knewest that I was an austere man, taking up that I laid not down, and reaping that I did not sow! Wherefore, then, gavest thou not my money into the bank, that at my coming I might have required mine own with

usury? . . . Take, therefore, the talent from him. . . And cast ye the unprofitable servant into the outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

This vivid symbol, with all its significance, is repeated in the woman's attempt to lay the blame of her sin upon the tempter: "The serpent beguiled me [by causing me to forget] and I did eat;" in which, also, an additional excuse is presented, namely, that she was betrayed by the tempter into forgetfulness of something pertaining to the Divine command. The repetition has the effect of solemn emphasis upon the import of the preceding symbol; besides which, the woman's forgetfulness is hardly of less significance. For when she saw that the forbidden tree was pleasant to the eye and good for food and desirable to make her wise, in what sense we have seen—whilst her heart was thus occupied with the desires of her earthly nature—it seems that the Divine prohibition, with the penalty of disobedience, ceased to stand before her mind, receded into the background, was no longer an object of her thoughts, still less of her faith. But this excuse was no more valid than others; for whatever it was that she forgot, that was the thing which she *ought* to have remembered. In all this, however, we are not to understand that her experience was different from that of her husband, but rather that it stands here recorded as a universal symbol; for thus it is universally with man. When the desires of the earthly nature and the reasonings of the carnal mind dominate over his spiritual nature—when the anticipated pleasures of sin, with all their attractions and charms, loom up before his mind—then the Divine law recedes into the background; its penalties grow dim and uncertain; in comparison with the immediateness of the anticipated pleasure, they seem very far off, and perhaps will never come at all. Thus the tempted soul is made to forget what above all things it ought to remember. Thus it is deceived and betrayed.

And, now, the voice of God has followed the first human sinners into their secret hiding-place, discovered and made them conscious of their nakedness, *i. e.*, of the inexcusableness of their sin, and brought them to submit themselves to His judgment: after which, we shall behold Him, in the mystery of His fatherly tenderness, by His own hand, and with new symbolical meaning, clothing their nakedness with a better covering than fig-leaves. In like manner, the judgment of God must finally reach the souls of all men who have "sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," and bring them to confession and repentance, before they can be clothed in the righteousness of the sacrificial Victim upon whom He has laid the sins of the world. For whilst they continue to cloak their sins, *i. e.*, to justify or excuse themselves by any devices which they can possibly think of, and thus to evade the conviction that they alone are to blame for all their transgressions, this judgment of God is yet a "judgment to come." But when the Divine voice in their consciences compels them to recognize their nakedness as still uncovered, all their devices of self-justification as no better than a flimsy girdle of fig-leaves, and all their attempts to cover their nakedness as adding to the inexcusableness of their sin; when, thus emptied of all self-righteousness and self-trust, they take to themselves all the blame of the sin which God charges upon them, and submit themselves to His judgment as most just and righteous altogether; then He always deals with them in fatherly tenderness and saving mercy. He judges the evil that is in them in order thereby to destroy it out of them. He clothes them in the righteousness of the sacrificial Victim whom He has provided to bear the sins of mankind—a better covering, indeed, for their shame than their own miserable attempts at excuses and self-justification. In fine, whatever chastisement, in the forms of labor and sorrow and death to their earthly nature, He may see fit to lay upon them,

will be only such as are indispensable, in their sinful state, to the purification of their souls and to their preparation for heaven.

IX

THE JUDGMENT UPON WOMAN

Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception [the sorrow of thy conception] in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children: and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

THE punishment of the tempter was truly and properly a malediction or curse, but these judgments pronounced upon the man and the woman were fatherly chastisements for their purification and salvation from sin. This distinction is of great importance on many grounds, and especially because it enables us to receive what is now so much insisted on concerning the uses and dignity of labor in perfect consistency with this account. For to man, being now a sinner, these chastisements are truly blessings in disguise, being indispensable to the reduction of his earthly and sensual nature to its original subjection. Accordingly, it is evident that, in the degree in which his deliverance from sin becomes realized, as Christian civilization makes progress, this tends to emancipate him from bondage to labor by subjecting the forces of nature to his control, so that they are made to do his work. Also, as the knowledge of his physical constitution increases, as medical science advances, as remedies come to be better known and more skilfully applied, as anæsthetics come into more common use, the pains and sicknesses which have their origin in sin, even those of childbirth, are sensibly mitigated, and may finally be done away. For we know not yet how far this tendency may ultimately reach, nor what fulness of meaning future generations may find in

the prophetic word: "There shall be no more death.... The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

It should be further observed here that this judgment upon woman is additional to all that she suffers under the chastisement inflicted upon man, and is, for the most part, peculiar to her. This, namely, that the heaviest punishment should be laid upon her, may seem strange to us, with our knowledge of the moral characters of the two sexes. Nor is it in any wise explained by the fact, that she was first in the transgression; for this judgment was not pronounced upon the first woman alone, but it includes all her female posterity, of whom in no sense can it be said that they go before or lead men into sin. The true solution of the difficulty lies in the symbolical character of the transaction, and in that these peculiar chastisements were indispensable, as we shall see, to the purification of the mothers of mankind, to whom, in fact, they have proved a source of the very greatest spiritual blessings.

With respect, now, to this subjection of the woman, it certainly was not altogether a consequence of sin, but grew, in part at least, out of her natural relation to man. For she was created inferior to him in stature, physical strength, and other elements of her earthly nature, including that of the prudential wisdom which stood at its head. Consequently their marriage union with each other must have implied, even in their estate of innocence, some degree of dependence upon him for direction and guidance and other matters pertaining to their earthly life and welfare. But this could not have been in any wise unpleasant or irksome to her, because he would require nothing but what was reasonable and right, and what would be her delight and happiness to render him. In fact, we must conceive of them both as being perfectly unselfish, and as preferring, from motives of love, each other's happiness to their own. Moreover, this relation of the woman to her husband, even whilst they were innocent, was, as it

still remains, a holy symbol, set up in the bosom of their daily life, to represent and cherish the consciousness of the union of their spiritual nature with God, and their subjection to Him as the husband of their souls. Hence it is written: "The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church... Therefore, as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let wives be to their own husbands." To the Church also it is said: "Thy Maker is thy husband;" and she is represented as "the Bride, the Lamb's wife." These spiritual relations were represented by the marriage of Adam and Eve in paradise more vividly than they have ever been since.

For the harmony of the marriage union suffered an earthquake-shock from the entrance of sin. The first woman, in the very act of her transgression, in that she took no counsel with her husband in a matter of such transcendent importance, asserted independence of him, and trampled upon the holy symbol of her dependence upon God. Now, therefore, that nature in her by whose proud exaltation to act independently, and to rule her spiritual nature, she has sinned, is violently thrust back, and held in subjection to her husband, in order that thereby it may be chastised and trained to submission and obedience to the authority of God. Nor did it require any efficient interposition on the part of God to produce this change, for it resulted necessarily from the new circumstances into which the woman had brought herself by her sin. This is indicated by the words: "Thy desire shall be to thy husband;" the meaning of which is plain from the similar expression which is applied to Abel, concerning whom it is said to Cain: "His desire shall be to thee, and thou shalt rule over him:" that is to say, Abel should be sensible of his inferiority to his brother in age, strength and dignity, should feel his dependence upon him as the inheritor of the birthright, and should look to him for counsel, guidance and protection, so that Cain would naturally have the ascend-

ency and rule over him. In like manner, the woman now, by stress of the new circumstances into which sin had brought her, would be forced to recognize her dependence upon her husband, as necessary to her support, and even to the preservation of her life. Henceforth with desire must she look to him for support, protection and guidance, and submit to his rule over her, even though it should be capricious, tyrannical and cruel. In fact, it could hardly be otherwise. For having seduced him into sin, whereby he had cast off the only adequate guidance of the wisdom of God, and had set up in its place as the law of his life the wisdom of his earthly and sensual nature, she had thereby destroyed all security for herself that he would require of her only what was reasonable and good and kind, and made it certain that he would often be unreasonable and exacting, passionate and jealous. Both of them, indeed, had now become selfish and wayward creatures, and would naturally prefer their own to each other's comfort and happiness. The unity of that nature in which they were one by marriage, from the perfection of which their mutual affections and desires had hitherto flowed so calmly and sweetly together, was now shattered. Conflicting judgments, opinions and desires would inevitably arise. Hence, for the possibility of their living together, one of them must be constituted the final arbiter of all such differences. But the woman could not stand in this relation to the man by reason of her inferiority in physical strength and other things which might be necessary to render her decisions effectual. Consequently, the man must be the head of the woman; and however capricious and tyrannical he might be, she could not be allowed to separate herself from him, except for one offence; and even this she would often find it better for herself and her children to pass over than to resent. Now, also, they were about to be driven forth from their blissful abode, where their food had stood ready provided to their hands, into a world of thorns and thistles, where

the earth would not yield them even a scanty subsistence, until it should be subdued by strenuous and persistent labor, to which the physical conditions of the woman were ill-adapted and altogether inadequate. Now, therefore, she would be compelled to recognize and feel her need of her husband's superior strength, courage and hardihood to labor for her support, to guide her steps through the pathless wilderness, and to defend her from violence in the times of unbridled lust, frequent murders, and universal lawlessness which were at hand. Indeed, if the woman had been left without special protection when "the whole earth was filled with violence," she might have perished, and with her the race of which she was to be the mother.

Thus we see that, by the mere fact of the entrance of sin, the relation which had previously subsisted between the sexes, though not subverted, was necessarily and essentially modified. That blissful dependence of the wife upon her husband, which was the perfect symbol of the dependence of their souls in faith and love upon God, became, in so far as their union was vitiated by sin, subjection; and this represented the new relation to God into which sin had brought them, and in which love alone would not be adequate, but He must maintain His authority over them for their good by his superior power. This subjection of the woman to her husband, however, pertains only to her earthly and mortal nature, by which she is united to him in marriage. In her spiritual nature, she is essentially free, and responsible to God alone, who is the only true and lawful husband of her soul: and if her human husband command her to do what God has forbidden, it is her duty to disobey, whatever be the consequences, for "we ought to obey God rather than men." God alone is the Lord of the conscience in woman as in man.

This Divine symbol is now a most blessed means of grace to married people, but especially to the wife, because

it nourishes her sentiment of dependence upon and subjection to God. Indeed, it can hardly be doubted but that to its influence the superior susceptibility to religious impressions of woman, as such, is in great part to be ascribed. For as the essence of sin is rebellion against God, so the very heart and substance of true piety is submission—the submission of the earthly to the spiritual nature, of the spiritual nature to the conscience, and of the conscience to the word and wisdom of God—the submission of conscious dependence, faith and love—passively, *i. e.*, to all the dispensations of Divine providence, and actively, in obedience to all God's commands and ordinances. To this subjection woman is trained from generation to generation by the relation in which the wife stands to her husband. To her it is, in some sort, what the child's subjection to his parents is to him—what the law of Moses was to the sincere Israelite—'her schoolmaster to lead her to Christ.' Hence, in general, she has become more submissive and docile to the Lord's instructions than is man. For there is no one in this world to whom he is put in subjection, and, consequently, the earthly nature in him has unfolded itself with a ranker luxuriance than in her. His natural mind has thus become so puffed up with conceit of knowledge and power in earthly and perishable things that he finds great difficulty in stooping and humbling himself to the submission of faith. He can hardly recognize it as a fool in spiritual things, that he may become truly wise by submitting it to the authority of the wisdom of God. Thus "the carnal mind" has attained to a more formidable development in man than in woman—to such arrogance, indeed, that often he undertakes to account for her greater susceptibility to piety by her intellectual inferiority. But she is inferior only in that which is "of the earth, earthy," and in that wisdom which is conversant only with perishable things; whilst in

meekness, obedience, self-sacrifice, and that 'charity which never faileth,' she is often and greatly his superior.

Thus we are enabled to appreciate the Scriptural form of the marriage vow, in which the woman promises to "love, honor and obey her husband." For thus only can this hallowed union fulfil the spiritual purpose for which it was ordained of God, namely, that it might serve as a holy, even a sacramental symbol of the mystical union between the Lord and His church, which is His Bride. Nor is it inconsistent with, but rather a consequence of this, that, in the degree in which married life becomes purified from sin and its consequences, it tends to revert to what it was in paradise before the fall; that is to say, the authority of the husband ceases to be exercised otherwise than in forms which can hardly be recognized, and the obedience of the wife becomes simply that of love—to her a perennial well-spring of happiness. For wherever the authority of the husband makes itself irksomely felt, and the wife yields an unwilling obedience, there is an imperfectly sanctified marriage, there sin and its inevitable consequences still abound.

With respect to the other part of this judgment upon woman, it plainly implies that if she had never sinned, though, doubtless, she would have borne children, she would have been exempt from the pains and sorrows of parturition. These are here represented as originating in and accounted for by sin, precisely as the shame of the naked body. Nor is there anything incredible in this when we consider how very light these sorrows are among savages, to whom the moral law is almost unknown, and in whom 'sin, after the similitude of Adam's transgression,' is not pronounced nor clearly defined. For it is only among civilized peoples, where, through luxury and other influences, the physical constitution of woman has become vitiated and enervated, and where the spiritual is consciously subjected to the appetites and desires of the

earthly and sensual nature, that this memorial of her sin takes on its most terrible form: at the same time, it is sensibly mitigated, as we see, and may be ultimately done away, by the progress of medical science and art, which have their roots in Christianity, and by the universal prevalence of Christian morality.

In the present state of our knowledge, indeed, we cannot trace the immediate causal connection between the sin of the woman and this chastisement, as we have done in the case of her subjection, and in that of the shame of the naked body. But the symbolical and teleological connection is quite obvious. For she had sinned, as we have seen, by the exaltation of her earthly and carnal wisdom to control the wisdom of God in her spiritual nature, as the law of her discernment between good and evil. For the gratification of the lust of the eye, and of the lust of the flesh in her sense of taste, and of a carnal desire to be wise in a way that it was impossible she should be, she had rebelled against the authoritative guidance of God in his commands and prohibitions. Consequently there was now attached to her gratification of those desires in which the whole fulness and strength of her sensual nature were summed up and concentrated the most fearful anguish and sorrow which she could suffer and yet survive. Thus she received in that nature by which she had been seduced and betrayed this most significant and awful memorial of the nature of her sin, that by it she might be chastened, and might go in penitence and humiliation all her days. And as the first sin contained the root and principle of all sin, so this chastisement passed over upon all her female posterity.

Hence it is that throughout the Scriptures this judgment upon the woman is taken as the symbol of God's judgments upon sin in general, in order to represent and to impress upon the human mind and heart the truth, that, although the sinner may pursue for a time the gratification

of the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eye, and the pride of a life independent of God; although the pleasures of sin may be keen and transporting, and their penal consequences may be long delayed; yet they are inevitable, and shall come upon him suddenly with such surprising and intolerable anguish that all these fleeting pleasures shall be no more remembered, or only with the agonies of remorse and shame. Thus in the following and many similar passages: "For when they shall say, Peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with-child, and they shall not escape... Pangs and sorrow shall take hold upon them; they shall be in pain as a woman that travaileth."

Hence, also, under this powerful symbol is represented the judgment of God for the sins of mankind as taking effect upon the great sacrificial Victim, through whose travail sorrows the souls of His people are born into the new life, and this, together with His unutterable joy over their new birth. Thus in the words of the prophet: "When thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see His seed... He shall see of the travail of His soul and shall be satisfied." And, perhaps, there is nothing which so powerfully rebukes the cavilling of the carnal mind against the mystery of the atonement as this dread symbol, in which all who have ears may hear the voice of God to mankind, saying: Do you not see that every child of human parents is born through the pangs and sorrows of its mother? Can you think that I have ordained this great mystery to no purpose, or that it can be without spiritual significance? Let it put to silence the cavils of your wisdom, which is folly, against the birth of the children of my kingdom into their true life through the travail sorrows of Him who is both their spiritual father and mother.

In fine, this chastisement upon woman could not fail to exert a powerful influence for the purification of her heart

and life. Through all generations of human life upon the earth, it has stood before her mind in every temptation to unchastity, threatening her with its awful premonitions and terrors. The impression which it makes upon mothers is imparted to their daughters, who have never experienced it, through the silent but all-powerful intercommunion of life. Hence, in the normal moral condition of the two sexes, where man abandons himself, woman shrinks and trembles before the terrible future. Thus, in general, she has become more pure of heart than is man. The worldling, or debauchee, who knows her chiefly through those of her sex whom his lust has ruined, may sneer at this, but it is none the less true. Woe to the human race if it were not! For if man had met with no obstacle to his unbridled passions in the repelling and subduing purity of the female heart; if he had not been constantly bathed in the purifying waters which flow from the hearts of mothers, wives, sisters and daughters; it can hardly be doubted but that the human race itself would long ago have perished from irredeemable corruption.

Under the purifying influence of this two-fold chastisement—the sorrows of childbirth and subjection to her husband—woman has become more susceptible to the saving power of the gospel than is man. He, indeed, may be more capable of discursive thinking. To him religion itself is often but a thought. He is ever prone to mistake knowledge for life. He would much rather understand than submit his mind to the mysteries of redemption and salvation. A hard saying to him is that of the Lord: "If ye will do the will of my Father, then shall ye know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." It is a stumbling-block to him, that the obedience of faith must always precede sight or knowledge [γνῶσις] *i. e.* knowledge in the clearness and demonstration of ideas. But with woman it is all different. She more easily submits her mind and heart to the authority of

the Lord. To her the gospel is a life rather than a thought: and, by the intercommunion of life, as once she led her husband into rebellion and sin, so now she leads him back to the submission and obedience of faith, informing his life with her own meek and obedient spirit, shedding upon his heart a better light than that of knowledge —the light of faith and love—and breathing into his soul something of the superior purity which she derives from her peculiar chastisement. Hence it is the Seed of the woman, as distinguished from the man, who crushes the serpent's head; and it was a woman who first recognized the Seed when He came into the world. Women were His most devoted followers and ministers whilst He tabernacled in the flesh. Women were the last at His cross, and the first at His tomb; and it was to a woman that He first appeared after His resurrection from the dead.

X

THE JUDGMENT UPON MAN

And unto Adam He said: Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it, cursed is the ground for thy sake: in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life: thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field: in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

THE first man, in yielding to the solicitation of his wife, put himself under the law of his earthly nature, by which he was united to her and rendered susceptible to her influence. His sin, therefore, was the same in substance with hers, and hence it is here judged in a similar manner. Yet there is a difference between these judgments, in that one of them is more comprehensive than the other—that of woman being, for the most part, confined to her, whilst that of man includes both man and woman. It is true, indeed, that the peculiar chastisement of woman necessarily and powerfully affects, through sympathy and otherwise, the life of man. For the marriage union is of such a close and vital nature that the two persons who are thus made one are unavoidably and largely partakers of each other's good and evil. But this judgment upon man rests also on woman in all its particulars, for labor, sorrow and death are the common lot of humanity.

The curse which is here laid upon the ground for the sin of man does not necessarily imply any miraculous change passed upon it or its productions: our understanding of it should rather be conformed to the interpretation

which has been given of the malediction upon the serpent. For the necessity of severe and painful labor would naturally come upon our first parents as the result of their expulsion from the garden of Eden, where, with little exertion on their part, the fruit of the trees supplied their simple wants. This is evident from the fact, that such an abode was provided for their innocence, which implies that the surrounding country was not equally suitable, and allows us to conceive of it as a wilderness which would bring forth thorns and thistles, until it should be subdued and cultivated by human labor. Nor is there anything improbable in this, when we consider that the sin and fall of man were certainly foreseen by the all-wise Creator, and, consequently, a suitable abode and environment might well be prepared for him as a sinner beforehand, where strenuous labor would be necessary for his support. This view is further confirmed by the command which was given him before he had sinned to "replenish the earth and subdue it," in which it is necessarily implied that the earth then required to be subjugated by human toil. Thus everything, as it came from the hand of the Creator, would be "very good" for that purpose for which it was created. However this may be, the natural world, in its present condition, is manifestly designed and adapted to be an abode and sphere for a sinful race.

On the other hand, it is not incredible nor unscriptural that some change may have passed upon the earth and nature in consequence of the sin of man. Not unreasonably we may conceive of the life of man as being so connected, through his material nature, with that of animals and plants, and through them with the earth itself, that the whole natural world becomes, in some sort, a partaker of his good and evil. Evidently there is a certain correspondence and reciprocal influence between man and nature, and between the natural and spiritual worlds. Such correspondence is assumed in the parables of our Lord,

and in almost all Scriptural images and symbols. Figurative language itself rests upon it. And this reciprocal influence we see in the differences which have been produced by natural causes between the inhabitants of tropical, temperate and polar countries, between the black and white man; as, also, in the modifications which take place in animals and plants under domestication, and in all the manifold results of human agency upon nature. It has been observed, even by a skeptical historian, concerning the repulse of the Gauls from the siege of the temple of Apollo at Delphi by astonishing manifestations in nature: "This is very possible; for . . . it has happened more than once that such extraordinary phenomena occurred in such decisive moments."* Hence, when the people of the old world were morally ripe for the judgment of God, a deluge of water was already prepared and in waiting to execute it. When the time was fulfilled that the earth should not again be destroyed in a similar manner, there was a rainbow which could be designated as the token and seal of God's covenant with Noah and his posterity, that there should be no more flood. We see the same thing in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and in the plagues of Egypt. Also, in that great battle which Joshua fought against "the five kings of the Amorites . . . the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them . . . they were more which died with hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew." At the same time, there occurred phenomena in the heavens which were regarded by those who witnessed them as the standing still in mid-course of the sun and moon, in order that the victory might be completed. In like manner, "the stars in their courses fought against Sisera." And passing over a multitude of similar instances, we have it recorded that, at the crucifixion of the Lord, "the earth did quake, and the rocks were rent . . . and the sun was darkened, and the vail of the temple

* B. G. Niebuhr's *Lectures on Ancient History*, Vol. III., pp. 274-5.

was rent in the midst," together with many other portents and prodigies in the natural world.

Moreover, it would seem from the prophecies on this subject that the renovation of the life of man through the faith of Christ will bring with it the deliverance of the physical world from its present disorders. We can hardly attach any other meaning to the following passage from St. Paul: "For the earnest expectation of the creature [nature, as distinguished from man] waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity [evil] not willingly [not for its own sin] but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope [by the will of God for His own wise and good purposes, with the promise of ultimate deliverance]. For the creature itself, also, shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Expressions of similar import abound in the Scriptures: "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them... Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir-tree, and instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle tree... And I saw a new heaven and a new earth... And He that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new." Now, by whatever figures of speech these glowing predictions may be interpreted, they can hardly be made to signify less than that the renovation of human life will be accompanied by changes in the condition of the earth which will render it as suitable an abode for the saved as the garden of Eden was for man's primal innocence. For this new life, when it shall be perfected, will require, as its appropriate sphere and environment, that "new earth" which the apostle John saw in his beatific visions. But how this "restitution of all things" will be brought about, we do not certainly know; perhaps, in part at least, by the

progress of science in subjugating the forces of nature and the properties of matter to human control.

However these things may be, we see here that, as the garden of Eden has hitherto been the appropriate abode and significant symbol of man's innocent and happy life, so now, under this judgment of God, he is placed in a very different sphere and environment, which symbolizes, in the most expressive manner, the spiritual evils which he has brought upon himself by his sin. The evil which has entered into him, the heart, head and intellectual eye of nature, in whom all its perfections are summed up, is now reflected in the whole creation around him, as in a thousand-faced mirror. He has broken up the harmony between himself and the world above him, and the world below him is no longer in harmony with him. He has come under bondage to corruption, and all things created for him are brought under similar bondage. Selfishness towards God has become the law of his life, and selfishness towards him has become the law of all things depending upon him. He has become a rebel and an enemy against God, and now the world that was put under him is in rebellion and enmity against him. Storms and tempests, earthquakes and volcanoes, noxious diseases, ferocious beasts and poisonous reptiles—the fatal forces of nature—will seek to dethrone him, as he has sought to dethrone God. He must now re-assert and maintain his rule over them by his intelligence and superior power, as God will maintain His dominion over him because "the weakness of God is stronger than man." As he has refused to yield unto God the fruit of a willing and cordial obedience, so the earth will no longer render spontaneously her fruits to him. As he, left to his native tendencies, by his own wisdom and choice, will be fruitful in growths of sin and misery, so the untilled earth will produce thorns and thistles and poisonous plants. As the ground must now be broken up with the plough, tilled, fertilized, planted, and its growths tended

in the sweat of his brow, so must he also be broken up with affliction and sorrow, ploughed over and over again with Divine chastisements, the seed of spiritual life communicated to him anew, and carefully tended by the heavenly "Husbandman," before he can be made to yield any good fruit. *

The labor and sorrow of mankind, however, do not spring altogether from conditions of the earth, but chiefly from the nature of sin, of which they are the necessary consequences. For in adopting his own creature wisdom as the law of his discernment and choice between good and evil, man put himself under a totally inadequate and blind guide, which could not fail to lead him astray, nor to disappoint him in his pursuit of happiness, and

* Hence the word tribulation, which literally signifies the threshing of corn from its husk and chaff, has come to be applied to those afflictions and sorrows by which God purifies the soul from its sins. And not only the threshing and winnowing, but also the grinding of corn into flour for bread, have thus become a most expressive image of what man must undergo, in order that he should be brought again to serve the uses of his Maker. This striking symbol has been developed by one of our early Christian poets as follows:

Till from the straw the flail the corn doth beat,
Until the chaff be purged from the wheat,
Yea, till the mill the grains in pieces tear,
The richness of the flour will scarce appear.
So till men's persons great afflictions touch,
If worth be found, their worth is not so much,
Because, like wheat in straw, they have not yet
That value which in threshing they may get.
For till the bruising flail of God's corrections
Have threshed out of us our vain affections;
Till those corruptions which do misbecome us
Are by thy Sacred Spirit winnowed from us;
Until from us the straw of worldly treasures—
Till all the dusty chaff of empty pleasures—
Yea, till His flail upon us God doth lay,
To thresh the husk of this our flesh away,
And leave the soul uncovered—nay, yet more,
Till God shall make our very spirit poor—
We shall not up to highest worth aspire;
But then we shall, and such is my desire.

See *Trench On the Study of Words*, p. 39.

following which he must inevitably choose evil for himself instead of good. Hence whatever he attains fails to satisfy his desires, and he is ever tormented with a feeling of emptiness and want; the more he gains of that which seems good in his own eyes, the more he finds that it has no power to satisfy the cravings of his heart; for the true and soul-filling good is not attainable otherwise than under the guidance of the wisdom of God. It is this ever unsatisfied craving, of which none are without painful experience except those who have become altogether brutalized, which drives us forth on an ever fruitless quest, with labor and sorrow perpetually renewed. In youth, the world opens upon our senses with the most glowing promises, awakening the most confident expectations, that, with prudence and industry, we shall be able to work out for ourselves something which will make us happy. But when we succeed in obtaining or accomplishing any particular object, we find it altogether empty; and the experience of such disappointments, constantly repeated, pierces our hearts with the sharpest thorns. Yet we turn with renewed hope to other objects of pursuit, which lead us on to new toils of body and mind to experience new disappointments and sorrows. Still we are not convinced that the guide of life which we have chosen is inadequate and blind, and must forever lead us astray. Thus we are constantly attracted to new objects, to which "distance lends enchantment," and which we clothe with all the illusions of sense and of the carnal mind. From the ashes of our ruined hopes new hopes arise with more potent delusion. What seems to our wisdom as if it could not fail to give us happiness, in ever-varying forms of earthly beauty and sensuous attraction, leads us a long and weary chase from object to object, as the butterfly lures the child from flower to flower, until at last it rises out of his sight. Earthly pleasure is wooed with all the ardor of idolatry, and she does not withdraw her veil, nor reveal herself as the loathsome corpse

she is, until the heart is married to her deformities and corruptions.

Here is the main cause of man's ceaseless toil and sorrow, the perennial root of the thorn and the thistle. The Divine judgment which condemns him ever to seek and never to find is the necessary consequence of the nature of his sin. And through this most sorrowful experience he has been passing from generation to generation and from age to age. Ever since the fall, he has been laboring to dig out of the earth, that is, to find in earthly things, something to satisfy the deep craving of his spiritual and immortal nature—something in the place of that which he lost when he cast off the guidance of the wisdom of God to follow his own wisdom in the choice which he has every moment to make between good and evil. Thus he still continues to repeat an experiment which has always failed, and which must forever fail. For all the fruits of his labor—all things that he works out by his own wisdom—his riches, sciences, kingdoms, empires, republics and civilizations—all fail—and still he is in want—still he is pierced with the thorn and the thistle, whose growth is perennially renewed—still his sorrows multiply, and his labor never comes to an end.

If it had been otherwise, it is easy to see that salvation from sin would have been forever impossible. For if man had been allowed to remain in his garden of delight, or had been able, by his own wisdom, without labor or sorrow, to supply all his earthly wants, he would have lost all remembrance of the holy and blessed estate from which he has fallen, and would have come to regard his own wisdom as an all-sufficient guide of distinction between good and evil. With all his earthly appetites, desires and affections in their full strength, with the means of their ample gratification ever at hand, their most intense and protracted pleasures unattended by disease, pain, remorse, or sorrow in any form, with no fear of death before his

eyes, he must, in no long time, have lost all feeling of spiritual need, and all consciousness of sin. His conscience already confused, darkened, dethroned, would have been silenced by the unrestrained gratification of the lusts of his sensual nature—would have ceased to give forth its oracles in his soul. He would have become utterly stupefied in his spiritual nature, and thus would have sunk down to a level with the brute. For even in our present circumstances, this effect of temporal prosperity is mournfully exemplified. When a worldly-minded man is very prosperous, and comparatively exempt from sickness, pain and sorrow, not infrequently he seems to lose all feeling of the want of anything better than this earth can give, and all conscience of sin. Such is the fool in our Lord's parable, who is represented as saying to himself: "Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years: take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry." And of such it is said: "Their heart is as fat as grease, their eyes stand out with fatness, and they have no bands in their death"—also: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God."

Thus we see that this judgment of labor and sorrow came upon man by necessary consequence from the nature of his sin, and that it constitutes a Divine memorial and holy symbol to nourish the feeling of spiritual want in his soul, to work in his heart, by painful experience, the conviction that his own wisdom is an inadequate and blind guide for his discernment between good and evil, and to lead him back to the submission of faith in the wisdom of God. For it is only through this feeling of want that he retains the capacity for receiving Christ as "the bread of life," which alone can satisfy the hunger of his soul. If never before, yet when he is worn down with fruitless labor of body and mind, when racked with sickness and pain, heart-broken with affliction and sorrow, then he feels the need of spiritual consolation, of something which this

world cannot give, and turns away from all earthly things to the word and wisdom of God made flesh, to 'that bread of life which came down from heaven, whereof if a man eat he shall hunger and thirst no more.'

With respect now to the judgment of death, with which that of labor and sorrow is here crowned, several obscure points require to be elucidated. For in this account of the origin of death in the human world, no light is thrown upon its prevalence in the lower realm of animals and plants, which, therefore, we are left to understand, as best we can, from the light of reason and nature. Now, that death reigned in the world of these lower organisms ages before man appeared on the earth, the present state of science does not permit us doubt. But this does not prove that this is no way dependent upon, or connected with, the sin of man. For the whole previous creation, including all that took place in those ages, was evidently a preparation for man in his present sinful and fallen state; and, as we have seen, it was no less proper and necessary that, in this state, he should be surrounded by great disorders in the natural world than that an abode sequestered from all such disorders should be provided for his primal innocence. All these, therefore, including death in organic nature, we may best understand as ordained of God in foresight of, and preparation for, the sin and fall of man. Nor is it probable that, if he had never sinned, his natural life would have been immortal upon the earth. For there seem to be reasons in his physical constitution why this should not be so, which cannot be ascribed to sin; and if the human race had not been depleted in some way, it would seem to be impossible that its numbers, ever multiplying in a geometrical ratio, should have found even standing-room on the earth. Hence it is more reasonable to believe that, if men had never sinned, they would have been transplanted into some other state and sphere, yet without sickness or infirmity, perhaps by way of trans-

lation, of which Enoch and Elijah furnish us with illustrious examples.

Here, also, it should be carefully observed that the words, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," can have no reference to the spiritual nature of man, which was not made out of the dust of the ground, but which God breathed into him. In strictness of logic, they can apply only to his material nature, for only that which was taken from the ground can be said to return to it again. But the original declaration, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," has a more comprehensive meaning, and certainly includes man's spiritual nature, in which sense it was literally fulfilled. For his spiritual life, consisting in the knowledge and love of God, and nourished by the living bread of the word and wisdom of God, did perish the moment he lost his faith in God, and began to act from the dictates of his own wisdom and will in violation of God's commands. And now this spiritual death is to be reflected and symbolized in that of his earthly nature, by whose proud exaltation to rule where its place was to obey he has sinned. The one was a natural, nay, a necessary consequence of the other. For the blind guide which he had chosen to follow would constantly lead him astray to choose evil instead of good—evil for the body as well as for the soul—and this would necessarily generate physical diseases, and work death in his earthly, as it had already done in his spiritual nature. In fact, at the point where these two natures were vitally united with each other in one and the same personality, death in the one would inevitably pass over and become death in the other.

Thus all the diseases of the body became the scriptural symbols of the spiritual malady of sin. Hence the leprosy, being regarded as the worst and most incurable of all, was selected by Moses, and treated with a great variety of ritual observances, in order to interpret and enforce upon the minds of his people its spiritual significance.

Hence also the prophets represent their spiritual and moral condition under such symbolical expressions as the following: "The whole head is sick and the whole heart faint: from the sole of the foot even to the head, there is no soundness in it, but wounds and bruises and putrifying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment." Thus also natural death became the great image and symbol of spiritual death, as in the following examples: "To be carnally minded is death. . . He that loveth not his brother abideth in death. . . He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me . . . is passed from death unto life." In these and ten thousand similar expressions, it is evident that what is signified by the word death is not the extinction of the natural life, but the effects and consequences of sin in the spiritual nature, of which the death of the body is taken as the outward form and sensible representation. Hence, when Christ came into the world, it was as the great Physician of souls; and He could do nothing more significant of His power to heal our spiritual maladies and to restore our spiritual life, than to heal, as He did, all manner of physical diseases and to raise the dead. It is only from this point of view that His miracles of physical healing can be rightly comprehended.

Natural death, then, is the Divinely ordained symbol and image of spiritual death—of 'death in trespasses and sins'—and as such it is infinitely expressive and terrible. For in the presence of a corpse, even the most thoughtless are struck with a certain mysterious awe, and all expressions of levity are felt to be utterly incongruous. How pale and rigid are these human features! These eyes, once so quick and bright and full of expression, have lost all speculation, and are without one gleam of intelligence. All the avenues of the senses are quite closed up. Complete insensibility—no volition, no thought, and cold, ah, how cold! No natural period can be assigned to this dream-

less sleep. No human power can recall this dead body to life, or restore light to these darkened eyes. And already there are signs of decomposition—the air is tainted. In a little while, this form, so "fearfully and wonderfully made," will pass through all the stages of dissolution and loathsome corruption, so that it must be separated from all communion with the living—buried out of their sight—that it may not generate in them also disease and death. Such is the dread symbol which God has ordained to represent that spiritual death which 'has come upon all men, for that all have sinned.' For thus man, in his natural or Adamic state, is dead to all spiritual things—dead to the evils of his spiritual condition—dead to the consciousness of his sin, guilt and danger—dead to the feeling of spiritual want—dead to the knowledge of God, to the love of Christ, and to all the motives and obligations of grace—dead to the truths, admonitions, warnings, promises and hopes of the gospel. If you speak to him of these things, they make no impression upon his mind—he knows not what you mean. Already he is undergoing spiritual decomposition which is loathsome to God, and pestilential to all other human souls. Left to himself, abandoned by the Spirit of God, he will soon become a mass of corruption, which must be put away out of sight—buried in the grave of the dead soul—separated from all communion with living souls—that he may not infect and poison their spiritual atmosphere. And from this state of death in sin, no man has power to raise himself to life. No merely human help can ever reach his case. Even the preaching of the gospel, apart from supernatural influences accompanying it, however eloquent and touching, is utterly in vain, as it actually proves to multitudes of dead souls.

This tremendous symbol of spiritual death has been set up in man's earthly nature because it was by its proud elevation he sinned. Hence the light of this nature goes out in utter darkness, that is, because it has proved an

ignis fatuus to lead him astray from the path of life. Hence death comes upon him in spite of all his prudence and vigilance to guard against it, in order that he may be made to know and feel that the guide he has chosen in place of the wisdom of God is utterly incompetent to distinguish aright between good and evil. Also the darkness in which the light of the mortal life goes out represents and symbolizes the horrible darkness to spiritual things which sin has brought into the soul of man. The pain and agony and sorrow of dissolving nature represent the pain and agony and sorrow of spiritual and eternal death—what Jesus calls 'the worm that never dies, and the fire that never shall be quenched.' And in that death comes upon all the children of Adam, even upon infants, it signifies that spiritual death, in germ if not in full growth and development, is implanted in every human soul. For "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned."

In fine, this fearful chastisement was laid upon man in mercy, and not in wrath, as indispensable to his salvation. For the awful apprehension and fear of death is one of the strongest motives to deter from crime, and to lead sinners to repentance. If it had not been for this, there is little room for doubt but that the human race would have sunk into irretrievable perdition. We see evidences of this in the history of the old world, when the life of man was almost indefinitely prolonged, and universal corruption prevailed, so that, as it would seem, even God could do nothing better with the race than to destroy it. For the symbol and chastisement of death occurred so seldom from natural causes, and could be regarded as so far off, or uncertain, that its influence to deter from crime could scarcely have been felt. Hence mankind were left free to rush into the most horrible excesses, so that the earth was soon filled with violence and blood. And when the time came for a Divine promise that there should be no more a flood,

and, consequently, that moral corruption should never again rise to such a height as to make one necessary, human life had to be greatly shortened, and the frequency of death correspondingly increased, as one of God's greatest mercies and moral influences for the purification of human nature. And now death occurs so frequently in every community and in the bosom of every family, the sorrows of bereavement are so universal, life is so uncertain to the young as well as to the old, that only the most hardened can be insensible to the awe and fear which these influences naturally awaken, or insusceptible to the motives which they supply to prepare for eternity. Indeed, when the king of terrors enters into our houses, and lays his cold hands on our most beautiful and best beloved, when we behold them in the agonies of dissolving nature, the light of their mortal life going out in utter darkness, and when we consign their bodies to the tomb, we cannot help feeling ourselves to be Divinely instructed and admonished that this earth is not our home, and of our need of being ever prepared for our own decease. Thus, also, the consciousness of immortality is nourished in our souls by the hopes which we cannot but cherish of reunion in the spiritual world with our loved ones who have gone before us. Hence it would seem that, apart from such influences, the Lord's purposes of grace and salvation could not have been realized, and that the thorn and the thistle are no more a blessing in disguise than the certainty and frequency of death.

Nor can this powerful symbol ever be dispensed with, except as the Lord's salvation makes progress in the world, by which, we are assured, the power of death shall ultimately be broken and destroyed. In fact, the average length of human life in Christian countries is now far greater than in any others. Wars, pestilences and famines are less frequent and less destructive in such countries than formerly they were, and still are among pagan and

Mohammedan nations, where Christian morality has gained no footing, where agriculture is less developed, where facilities for the transportation of food are altogether inadequate, and where municipal cleanliness and sanitary science are almost unknown. Meanwhile, death is not death to the Lord's true people. For them He has conquered this king of terrors; " hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." To the true Christian, the grave is no longer dark, since the Saviour has burst open its portals. It is now the low door through which, bowing our heads, we enter the glorious mansions of our Father's house. And in this sense it is written: "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.... O death, where is thy sting! O grave, where is thy victory!"

XI

THE CLOTHING WITH SKINS

Unto the man also and his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins and clothed them.

God did not spare, as we have seen, to pronounce and inflict upon man for his sin the tremendous judgments of labor and sorrow and death; and can it be supposed that He now goes about to provide him with a good suit of clothes, and that, by such means as stripping their skins from innocent animals, for no other purpose than to keep him warm, or to relieve him from a trifling bodily inconvenience? No, this transaction cannot be so understood. Rationally considered, it must be recognized as a Divine mystery.

In order to disclose its symbolical meaning, we must recall the origin and significance of the shame of the naked body, as having sprung up in the human heart out of the spiritual shame of sin, which it symbolizes and represents. This physical shame the first sinners tried to cover for themselves, as best they could, with a flimsy girdle of fig-leaves. But, conscious that this was altogether inadequate, they were still ashamed and 'afraid because they were naked,' and fled to hide themselves from the presence of God amidst the trees of the garden. Here, being discovered by the Voice which followed them, they were compelled to render themselves up to the Divine judgment. And now they are clothed, not by their own but by the hands of God himself, in the skins of slain animals, and thus their shame is effectually covered.

Morever, that these animals were slain for sacrificial purposes hardly admits of a doubt when we consider that such sacrifices were certainly prescribed and enjoined upon this first human family. We have satisfactory evidence of this in the sacrifices of Cain and Abel. For in the epistle to the Hebrews, we are informed that "by faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts." Now faith, in its Scriptural sense, always implies a revelation from God in some form as its object. Hence the question necessarily arises, what had God revealed to these two brethren in which Abel believed, and in which Cain had no faith? In answer to this question, let it be observed, because it is significantly stated, that the sacrifices themselves were as different as were the receptions which they met with: "Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord, and Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering, but unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect." From this it might reasonably be inferred, and with a strong probability, that God had commanded them both to offer bloody sacrifices. But the subsequent words of God's remonstrance with Cain leave no room for doubt upon this point: "And the Lord God said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door." Now the Hebrew word here translated "sin" is frequently used, and elsewhere it is so rendered, in the sense of a sin-offering. Also, the word "lieth," more literally, is lying, is most frequently applied to animals. It contains even a reference to the peculiar manner in which quadrupeds dispose of their four legs in lying down to rest. For these reasons, the best Hebrew scholars and interpreters of Scripture have long been agreed in rendering "sin lieth at the door"

a sin-offering is lying down at the door; and, thus interpreted, the sense of this Divine remonstrance with Cain is as follows: Why art thou disappointed and angry? What else couldst thou expect but that thine offering should be rejected? If, indeed, thou hadst been without sin, it, consisting of fruits and flowers, would have been appropriate and acceptable; nay, thou wouldst have been accepted without any offering. But, being a sinner, a different offering was properly required of thee. Even yet, however, it is not too late; for the animal which I have designated as a sin-offering is now lying down at the door of thy tent. Take that, and having shed its blood, offer it to me in sacrifice, with confession of thy sins, and thou too shalt be forgiven and accepted. Hence the inference that the family of Adam had received a Divine command requiring them to offer bloody sacrifices, and that it was this revelation in which Abel believed, and Cain did not, seems inevitable: nor can we conceive of any more probable occasion on which these sacrifices were first offered than that on which God clothed the first sinners in the skins of slain animals.

Here, then, in the very commencement of human history, as soon as sin had entered into the world, God instituted that stupendous system of education and preparation for man's redemption by the sacrifice of the innocent for the guilty, of which we have such a full account in the Old Testament, and which He carried on with the utmost rigor and persistency until the great Victim suffered on the cross of Calvary. For this was an idea so foreign and naturally revolting to the wisdom of this world that it had to be laboriously educated into the human mind, in order to render faith in the validity and efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ to take away the sin of the world even a possibility. Hence this education was commenced as soon as man had sinned, even before he had left his primeval abode: and throughout the long line of patriarchs from

Adam to Moses, no other sacrifice, except this of Cain, is ever offered to God but those of animals in their blood. This primeval revelation flowing down through the ages in all the divergent streams of human life, affords us the most probable explanation of the offering of such sacrifices among the heathen, in which they may have been supported and confirmed also by a Divine instinct, like that of their blind faith in God, in immortality, and in a future judgment.

But in order that this educational preparation might be carried on in the most systematic and effectual manner, God, in due time, called Abraham out of the world, and made him the covenant head of a chosen people, whom he sequestered, as far as possible, from all foreign influences, and enjoined upon them an all-moulding system of political, social, moral and ritual institutions, laws and observances, in all which He seems to have kept this object steadily in view. Even the principal events of their history, such as those of the smitten rock of Horeb, and the brazen serpent in the wilderness, seem to have been Divinely ordained and pre-arranged with the distinct purpose of preparing their minds for the great sacrifice upon which the destiny of the world was to depend. But, above all, there were three lines of such preparation which require to be distinguished from all the others, and more particularly elucidated.

The first of these is that vast and most wonderful ritual of bloody sacrifices which was enjoined upon them by Moses, and which is so particularly and minutely described in the book of Leviticus. * This continued in force, and the burden of it was borne by the people with astonishing patience and constancy, for 1500 years;

* The criticisms of Kuenen, Wellhausen, Robertson Smith and others, in the judgment of the author, utterly fail to prove that the book of Leviticus was not written by Moses. He regards the methods of these writers as altogether untrustworthy, and as being speculative rather than critical.

during which, every morning and evening, and on all extraordinary occasions in the lives of individuals and in that of the nation, the blood of innocent victims, with the confession of sins, was offered to God. And, once a year, on the great day of atonement, the high priest, in the presence of the congregated thousands of Israel, made confession, in "large utterance," of the sins of the whole people, with the shedding of the blood of sacrificial animals, which he took and sprinkled on the mercy-seat of Jehovah-between-the-cherubim in the Holy of Holies. Almost everything in that ritual was purified with blood, 'and without the shedding of blood was no remission of sins.' This idea lay at the bottom of almost all the prescribed rites of the worship of God. It was symbolized and represented in every conceivable form. The whole religious, social and political life of the people was made to centre in and revolve around it from generation to generation and from age to age: and all this, that they might be filled with it, and their minds moulded upon it, that it might become the object of all their hopes for time and eternity. Such pains did God take to prepare the people out of whom the great sacrifice was to come, so that among them there might be raised up those who should believe in it, and go forth to preach it with power to all other nations.

No less educational and preparatory were the mediation and ministry of the prophets, who were appointed of God as the organs of His authoritative communications to His people in fulfillment of His declaration to Moses: "I will raise up unto them a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee, and I will put my words into his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I command him; and it shall come to pass that whosoever will not hearken unto the words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." For this wonderful prediction evidently referred primarily to that long line of prophets who succeeded Moses for more than a thousand years, and

ultimately to the great Prophet who should come into the world as the crowning term of the series. In this way, the people were familiarized with the idea of mediation between God and man, and with that of authoritative revelations of the spiritual world through mediatorship. This preparation was carried still further by that vast body of prediction concerning the Mediator to come which was delivered by the prophets, and in which were explicitly foretold His genealogical descent from Abraham through Judah and David, His supernatural birth of a virgin, the mystical constitution of His person as Immanuel, both God and man, the sinless perfection and sublime self-sacrifice of His character and life, His miracles and mighty works, and all the principal events of His earthly history, especially, His most holy sacrifice for the sins of the world, together with the regeneration of human life and society which should follow it, and the salvation of all who should believe in Him. But, above all, the circumstantial particularity with which the prophets described His sufferings and atoning death was evidently intended to deepen and perfect the impression made by the ritual of bloody sacrifices, that salvation could come to man in no other way than by the sacrifice of the innocent in place of the guilty. For these prophecies commence with the words of God to the original tempter of mankind: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her Seed: He shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise His heel." They are continued in the Messianic Psalms as follows: "I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint. My heart is like wax; it is melted in the midst of my bowels. My strength is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws, and thou hast brought me into the dust of death. For dogs have compassed me about, and the assembly of the wicked have enclosed me; they pierced my hands and my feet.... They parted my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture."

And the mediatorial and sacrificial character of His sufferings is thus exhibited: "Surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows.... He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid upon Him the iniquity of us all." In fine, the great object which should be accomplished by His sacrificial mediation: "When thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see His seed, He shall prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hands. He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied. By His knowledge [by the knowledge of himself] shall my Righteous Servant justify many, for He shall bear their iniquities.... Because He hath poured out His soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors, and bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors:" the final result of all which should be, "to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness." These are only a few examples of innumerable predictions in which the sacrifice of the great Victim, together with its consequences, was foretold in preparation for His coming, and which do not only demonstrate that sacrificial atonement for the sins of mankind entered into the Divine purposes of grace and salvation from the foundation of the world, but, also, by their punctual fulfilment in Jesus Christ, constitute overwhelming evidence that He was the true Messiah.

Also, the moral law, as delivered through the mediation of Moses, was intended from the first as a means to the same ultimate object: "The law was our schoolmaster [pedagogue] to bring us to Christ." For with all its perfection it could not save men from their sins. Nay, its perfection was the very thing which excluded them from

salvation. For it required a faultless obedience in thought, word and deed, and pronounced utter condemnation on every transgression: "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." It always was, and forever must be, impossible for sinful man to satisfy the claims of this law, not only because he is "without strength" unto a perfect obedience, but also because it finds him already a sinner, and under its condemnation, its demands being that it should never have been violated.

"Wherefore, then, serveth the law?" What was the precise effect which it was intended to work in order to prepare men for faith in the sacrifice of Christ? St. Paul, especially in his epistles to the Romans and Galatians, labors to elucidate this point. "The law," he tells us, "was added because of transgression, until the Seed should come.... The law entered that the offence might abound.... By the law is the knowledge of sin." He certainly does not mean by this that the law was given for the purpose of rendering man more sinful than he would otherwise have been, for sin is ever the abominable thing which God hates, and for the putting away of which He has made the greatest of all possible sacrifices. His eternal opposition to sin is just that which the law reveals and expresses by the terrible rigor of its prohibitions and condemnations. But the inborn corruption of human nature [ἡ ἁμαρτία] does not become actual transgression until the claims of the law are brought to bear upon it, "for where no law is there is no transgression;" nor is it recognized by the sinner as truly and properly sin, until it does pass into transgression. In fact, the consciences of those who are ignorant of the law, although their lives may be sunk in the depths of moral corruption, give them little trouble. But when they come to the knowledge of the law, this inherited corruption of their moral nature, by the acts of transgression to which it prompts, is evolved or brought out in the con-

sciousness and convictions of the soul, as the root, principle and very substance of all sin. Hence the agonized cry of the holy apostle: "When I would do good evil is present with me.... O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" The law, therefore, is God's means for making man to know how deep and radical his sinfulness is, and how helpless he is in himself under it, in order that thus he may be brought to feel his need of a Saviour.

It is true, however, that the law, though not the cause, is the incidental occasion of man's becoming more sinful than he ever could have been without it. This is frankly conceded by the apostle in such passages as the following: "Without the law sin was dead.... I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died.... For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me....Sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence.... The strength of sin is the law." His meaning is, that the moral corruption of human nature, by the pressure of the holy law, is stirred up to actual transgression and self-conscious rebellion; and the same truth is contained in the words of the Lord: "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin." Yet, as St. Paul strenuously insists, because the law is not the cause, but only the incidental occasion, of this increased sinfulness, this is not to be ascribed to the law, but to its true and proper cause, which is the native depravity of the human heart: "For the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good.... But I am carnal, sold under sin.... Was, then, that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin [it was, this depraved, perverse, corrupt moral nature, which was in me before I knew any law—this it was which was made death unto me] that it might appear sin [from the fact of its] working death in me by that which is good; that sin by

the commandment might become exceeding sinful." In other words, the exceeding sinfulness of the moral nature in man is brought out and demonstrated by the fact, that it perverts and abuses the just and holy and good law of God into an occasion of becoming more sinful than were otherwise possible.

All this in man proceeds from the same thing which in Adam made him afraid of God, and drove him to fly and hide himself from the Divine presence. For the law represents God in the sole attribute of justice, making inquisition for sin, and pronouncing condemnation upon the sinner; whom it finds in rebellion against its authority, with his mind darkened, and his heart alienated and hardened, so that he can neither feel nor see the paramount claims of Divine justice, and so grounded and built up in selfishness that he naturally prefers his own gratification to all other things, and cannot consent that even the justice of God, which has now become a terrible and hateful object, should be executed. Hence, whilst God is thus represented to his mind through the medium of the law alone, which thunders its fearful doom upon every transgression, his Maker himself becomes the object, not only of his fear, but also of his enmity; and this is the crowning term in the development of sin—to hate God is the life of spiritual death. From all this, it seems evident enough, that, whilst man continues under the law, *i. e.* whilst he regards it as a full and complete revelation of the character of God; whilst he continues to be agitated by the fear and embittered by the enmity which it stirs up in his heart, he cannot because he will not, or he will not because he cannot, return to God in submission, faith, love and obedience, but remains under a moral necessity to fly further and further from the source of his life, and to plunge himself deeper and deeper into sin and perdition. For, in the words of St. Paul: "The Scripture hath shut up all under sin, that the promise

by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe."

Through such experience as this the sinner comes to see and feel that, if he is ever to be saved at all, he must have some further revelation of the Divine character beyond all that is contained in the law; and thus his mind is opened, and he is otherwise prepared for the new disclosures of the gospel. Hence his need of a final and all-controlling revelation that God is not his enemy, but his best friend, even his Heavenly Father. He must be convinced that even the Divine justice, which pronounces the sentence of death upon the Adam in him, is not inconsistent, but is co-existent with such mercy and compassion and love in God that He is ready and willing to make the greatest possible sacrifice to save him from his sins. And because his sin consists in the adoption and preference of his own wisdom in place of the Divine as the guide and supreme law of his life, this manifestation of the love and fatherly heart of God towards him must be made in such form and manner that he cannot possibly believe in it without having the pride of his own wisdom crushed, and the wisdom of God restored to its true place and supreme authority over his mind and heart and life.

What, now, is that grand and solemn mystery which demands or can be fitly announced and ushered into the world by such a stupendous scheme of preparation as this? What can be the proper end and fulfilment of this vast ritual of shedding the blood of innocent animals, and offering them to God with confession of sins, during so many centuries? By what unique event in the history of mankind can the ministry and the predictions of the prophets through so many generations be crowned and fulfilled? How shall the expectation of a more full and complete revelation of the character and heart of God, which has been awakened and nourished by so many ages of a legal dispensation, be so met as to satisfy man's deep-

est necessities by reconciling him to God, and saving him from his sins? Let the answer be given in God's own words:

GOD SO LOVED THE WORLD THAT HE GAVE HIS ONLY BEGOTTEN SON THAT WHOSOEVER BELIEVETH IN HIM SHOULD NOT PERISH BUT HAVE EVERLASTING LIFE... WHOM GOD HATH SET FORTH TO BE A PROPITIATION THROUGH FAITH IN HIS BLOOD TO DECLARE HIS RIGHTEOUSNESS FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS THAT ARE PAST... THAT HE MIGHT BE JUST AND THE JUSTIFIER OF HIM WHICH BELIEVETH IN JESUS... HE IS THE PROPITIATION FOR OUR SINS AND NOT FOR OURS ONLY BUT ALSO FOR THE SINS OF THE WHOLE WORLD... FOR WHEN WE WERE YET WITHOUT STRENGTH IN DUE TIME CHRIST DIED FOR THE UNGODLY... WHEN WE WERE ENEMIES WE WERE RECONCILED TO GOD BY THE DEATH OF HIS SON... IN HIM WAS THE LOVE OF GOD MANIFESTED... HEREIN IS LOVE NOT THAT WE LOVED GOD BUT THAT HE LOVED US AND SENT HIS SON TO BE THE PROPITIATION FOR OUR SINS... GOD COMMENDETH HIS LOVE TOWARD US IN THAT WHILE WE WERE YET SINNERS CHRIST DIED FOR US... GREAT IS THE MYSTERY OF GODLINESS—GOD WAS IN CHRIST RECONCILING THE WORLD UNTO HIMSELF NOT IMPUTING THEIR TRESPASSES UNTO THEM

Such, then, is the grand mystery of the gospel, by which the sacrificial ritual and the prophetic ministry of the Old Testament are fulfilled and crowned; which reveals God in the fulness of His mercy and love; which brings deliverance from the condemnation of the law; which crushes forever the head of the serpent in man; which 'finishes the transgression, makes an end of sins, and brings in everlasting righteousness.'

For this most holy sacrifice of Christ is a stupendous mystery. This arises from the fact that it stands as a middle term between the incomprehensible nature of God and the no less incomprehensible nature of moral evil. It reaches

upwards into the infinity of God's being and attributes and downwards into the unfathomable depths of the origin and nature of sin. Hence it is, and must forever remain, a mystery to the finite mind; that is to say, it cannot be analyzed by logical processes, nor explained in logical conceptions. Let a man analyze God, explain God; let him solve to the satisfaction of the rational understanding the problem of the origin of evil: then may he undertake to explain why the innocent must suffer for the guilty, and how such suffering avails and operates efficaciously to atone for sin. Yet many attempts have been made at such explanations, but all of them have proved signal failures, as may be made to appear from one or two examples.

The first of these represents this sacrifice as having its necessity in public justice, as a grand governmental scheme to save the honor and maintain the authority of the violated law in the eyes of the moral universe, to which also the mercy and love of God are thus manifested. But it is certain that this view does not explain the ultimate ground of its necessity, as may be evinced by such considerations as the following: 1. The distinction which this scheme implies between God and His law cannot be maintained. For His law is the undistorted reflection and image of His nature and character, as respects the attribute of justice; how, then, can there be anything in this reflection which is not in that which is reflected? Consequently, if God's law demands such a sacrifice, there must be something in Him which demands it. In like manner the public justice of God can be nothing else but His essential justice, as realized and manifested in the government of His moral creatures. Hence we may eliminate the ideas of law and publicity from the whole question, and consider it as one between God himself and His sinful creatures. 2. The Divine law, as revealed to us, does not demand that the innocent shall suffer for the guilty, but

that every one shall be punished for his own sins: "The soul that sinneth it shall die," and not another in its stead. How, then, can the law be satisfied or vindicated by that which it does not demand, and which, by its very terms, it excludes? 3. When the sacrifice of Christ is thus resolved into a mere manifestation to make an impression upon the moral universe, if we suppose, as for the purpose of testing the scheme we have a logical right to do, that there is no such universe, but God alone with only one moral creature, and that this creature has sinned—in this case, there is no conceivable necessity for any such sacrifice, because there is no moral universe to be impressed by it. For aught that appears, that one sinner could be forgiven and saved as well without as with it. But from the manner in which it is always represented in Scripture, and from the personal and vital relation to it of every individual believer, there seems to be no room for doubt but that it would have been as necessary for that one sinner as it is for a million, or for mankind at large. 4. If the sacrifice of Christ have no other object but this of manifestation, for the purpose of making a good impression upon the moral universe; if it have no validity or necessity but that of its good effect as a public spectacle, it necessarily loses, as soon as this becomes known, all power to work any such effect. For what good impression can be produced on our minds by beholding the innocent suffering for the guilty, when we fully understand that there is no necessity for it but that of making such an impression? In fact, this conception of the most holy sacrifice reduces it to the category of a spectacular and theatrical performance, which, as soon as we are admitted behind the scenes, and are allowed to recognize its unreal character, loses all its power of illusion upon which its effect depends: to us it is no longer a real transaction. When, *e. g.*, we behold on the stage the murder of king Henry VI by Richard III, if the illusion

be well nigh perfect, and we can almost think it real, we are ready to start from our seats and cry out, Lay hold on the bloody murderer: but when we remember that it is nothing but a spectacular performance, having no ground or validity in itself, and no object but to produce a moral impression, we contemplate it with entire equanimity, and go home to sleep and forget it. From such considerations as these, we easily see that this governmental scheme affords no adequate explanation of the sacrifice of Christ. In fact, it is only when we understand that there is an eternal necessity for the sacrifice, arising out of the nature of God and the nature of sin, that it produces the effects which are ascribed to it as a spectacle. Then, indeed, it makes the most profound and awful impression upon the moral universe; then it constitutes the most glorious manifestation of the justice, grace, mercy and love of God; then does it accomplish all the governmental ends which this scheme has in view.

Another conception of this Divine mystery represents it as a true and effectual propitiation and satisfaction rendered to the essential justice of God, apart from which He could not, without the sacrifice of justice, have had mercy upon sinners, but must have treated them in all respects as they deserved—as that by which He makes it right for Him to forgive and save sinners, which otherwise would have been wrong. Properly, also, it includes the idea, that this propitiation renders God propitious, or disposed in himself to show mercy, although there are many theologians who do not so understand it. This view is evidently much more profound, and probably a nearer approach to the truth than the preceding, but it is encumbered with very grave difficulties, and consequently it fails to give entire satisfaction to the logical understanding.

For, in the first place, it does not, any more than the preceding, account for the substitution of the innocent in place of the guilty, nor show how this can be any true or

proper satisfaction to Divine justice. Theologians, in discussing these points, not unfrequently resort to sophistical reasonings. For God, they tell us, revealing His essential justice in His law, declares that all sin must be punished, but does not declare unchangeably upon whom this punishment is to be inflicted, whether upon the sinner himself, or upon a substitute; and this declaration, we are further told, is confirmed by the universal consciousness of mankind. But, unfortunately, neither of these statements is true. For the human consciousness does not yield abstract or general propositions such as this; they are reached only by the logical processes of abstraction and generalization. Consciousness, in all its deliverances, is exclusively concrete and particular. Search it as we may, we find no such proposition as this, that all sin must be punished; but we do find, after every known transgression, as written upon our very souls, the affirmation, This my sin ought to be punished upon me. Now, from this deliverance of consciousness, we may lawfully, as we find it to be universal, abstract the universal proposition, that all sin ought to be punished, but we cannot lawfully reason upon or draw conclusions from it as if it left the subject of such punishment undetermined. In strictness of logic, the proposition requires to be completed in this form, All sin ought to be punished on the sinner himself, which must be accepted or rejected in its totality. For whatever invalidates either part of it is equally destructive of the other. Still less, if possible, is the mutilated form of this proposition contained in any revelation of His justice which God has given us. For His law, as we have seen, proclaims in thunder-words, that the sinner must be punished for his own sins: "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." This is the voice of Divine justice, which certainly makes no provision for a substitute to suffer in the sinner's stead. How, then, it must be asked here, as in

the former case, can this law be satisfied with what it does not demand, and which is excluded by the very terms in which it is revealed? In fact, this attempt to show a necessity for the sacrifice of Christ from the groundless assumption, that the justice of God and human consciousness declare that all sin must be punished, but do not specify upon whom, whether upon the guilty or the innocent, is one of the most transparent sophisms ever devised to reconcile the wisdom of God with that of man.

In the second place, there is no Scriptural warrant for the notion, that, apart from the sacrifice of Christ, God would have been obliged in justice to treat all sinners as they deserved, and still less, if possible, for that of its rendering him propitious, or disposed to show mercy. For everywhere it is represented as having originated in the antecedent love of God for the sinful world. Influenced by this love He provided the Victim, and that, since nothing else would do, by surrendering His only begotten Son to the accursed death of the cross: "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." And this gift of His Son must necessarily be conceived of as implying and manifesting antecedently all the grace, mercy and love which flow from it. Hence all gracious dispositions must be recognized as existing in full activity in the heart of God prior to the atonement, and not as procured by it. He, then, apart from the atonement, was not obliged in justice to treat sinners as they deserved, for manifestly He did not so treat them when He gave His Son to ransom them by the sacrifice of himself from the punishment which they justly deserved. No less evident is it that God did not need to be propitiated, in the strict or proper sense of that word, for He was as propitious to sinners as it is conceivable that He could be when He provided such a Victim to suffer in their stead. Finally, if it would have

been inconsistent with His essential justice for Him to forgive and save sinners without an atonement, how was it not such for him to show them that mercy which provided an atonement for them?

These are some of the difficulties in consequence of which this method of evincing a necessity that the innocent should suffer for the guilty can never give entire satisfaction to the logical understanding. And, in fact, when this great mystery of grace and salvation is believed in on such grounds as either of these schemes presents, and otherwise would be rejected, it is received only because it is thought to commend itself to that very wisdom of man which, as applied to spiritual things, it is intended to crush. Now, from the failure of these two most comprehensive, plausible and widely accepted philosophies of the atonement, and from the fact that it is a middle term between two incomprehensible infinities, we may fairly conclude that it was intended forever to remain an insoluble mystery to our finite minds. Whence its necessity arises, and how it operates efficaciously to atone for sin, we must regard as among the secrets which God has reserved unto himself, and which, no doubt, it is absolutely impossible for us to comprehend, or resolve intellectually, so that they should be no longer mysteries to us. Indeed, we are Divinely forewarned that this substitution of the innocent in place of the guilty under the law and the justice of God could not be other than foolishness in the eyes of man's wisdom. For it is this substitution, beyond all other things, which makes the cross of Christ "a stumbling-block to the Jew and folly to the Greek," *i. e.* the greatest possible offence to the wisdom of this world, in all its variant national forms and different degrees of development and culture; not because it is folly, for in itself it is "the wisdom of God," but because human wisdom is foolishness with God, and "the foolishness of God is wiser than men." Hence it is not to be received or believed in for the above nor

any other explanations which have been or ever can be given of it, but simply on the authority of God, who has taken such infinite pains to educate and prepare the human mind for the faith of it, and has set it forth in Christ as the sole ground and hope of human salvation. This is the strongest evidence we could have of its necessity and efficacy. The bare fact, that God has given His only begotten Son to the cross for us sinners, and that 'Christ our Passover has been sacrificed for us,' is enough to give us assurance, beyond all other knowledge, that, as God viewed the matter, who only sees all things as they are, there was an infinite necessity for this great sacrifice, and of its Divine efficacy to take away our sins. Nay, it is safe to say that God himself did not know any other way in which He could save sinners, for if there had been any other way known to Him, He certainly would have spared His beloved Son the horrors of the cross. In fact, we do not need to understand the grounds of its necessity, nor the mode of its efficacious operation. On the contrary, it was fitting and altogether indispensable that our salvation should be made to depend upon something which could not be other than mysterious to us in the highest degree; in which we could not believe without the most plenary renunciation and abnegation of our own wisdom in application to spiritual things, and the most absolute and perfect submission of our minds to the authority of the wisdom of God. And this is just what takes place in every soul that comes to believe in this transcendent mystery. For when we do truly believe in the necessity, validity and efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ to atone for our sins, receiving it as the truth of God and the sole ground of our salvation, though it be foolishness in the eyes of our wisdom, then do we truly and utterly renounce and repudiate our own wisdom, and submit ourselves to the wisdom of God, as the only adequate guide of distinction between truth and falsehood, good and evil.

Here only do we fully recognize our own wisdom as foolishness with God, so that our confidence in it is forever subdued and overthrown; here only do we restore the wisdom of God to its true and original place and authority over our minds, hearts and lives. Thus it is, and not otherwise, that the head of the serpent in man is finally crushed under the bruised heel of the Seed of the woman, and that which was lost in the fall is recovered by faith in the atonement.

But if any one should ask, How can we believe in what seems foolishness to our wisdom? the following illustration may be given to solve this difficulty, and to throw still further light upon the relation to God's authority into which we come by the faith of this mystery. A little child, being left to his own judgment, will be perfectly sure, from the impression which the sun makes upon his sense of sight, that it moves through the sky, whilst the earth stands still. But his father informs him that this is not true; that the sun, contrary to all appearances, stands still, whilst the earth, which seems so solid and immovable, is spinning round faster than his top. He is too young as yet, and his mind is too feeble for him to receive any demonstration of this truth, but he has faith in his father's superior knowledge and wisdom, consequently he believes what he tells him, although it be thus contrary to all appearances. Now, in the exercise of such faith, in direct opposition to what would be his own independent judgment, he necessarily renounces his own wisdom, as not valid in the premises, and submits his mind to that of his father. He cannot so believe without recognizing and feeling that his own view of such things, as compared with that of his father, is foolishness. Such is the effect produced in man, who is God's little child, by faith in the sacrifice of Christ as 'the great mystery of godliness.' He, therefore, who would explain away its foolishness, which St. Paul was so careful to preach, "lest the cross of Christ should be

made of none effect;" he who would commend it in the eyes of man's carnal wisdom; labors to deprive it of all its power to crush the head of the serpent. Thus preached, after it has been thoroughly manipulated with this object in view, it comes forth like Samson from "the lap of Philistean Dalilah" shorn and betrayed. It is no longer St. Paul's but another gospel, which is neither stumbling-block to the Jew nor folly to the Greek, and consequently neither the wisdom nor the power of God unto salvation. For this great mystery of godliness is revealed from heaven to be submitted to, not reasoned away; to be believed in solely on the authority of God, and in full recognition of the truth, that 'His thoughts are not as our thoughts, nor His ways as our ways, but high as the heavens are above the earth so high are His ways above our ways and His thoughts above our thoughts.' *

Now, it is in this great sacrifice of atonement for sin that God reveals and manifests the fulness of His eternal love and pity for us sinners. For when we behold Him giving up His only begotten Son to die for us, we cannot but ask, What made Him do it? and the answer is, Because he so loved us. And when we behold the Son himself voluntarily yielding up His soul unto the accursed death of the cross, we ask again, What made Him do it?

* Olshausen, in his comments upon 1 Cor. I, 18, 19, and II, 6, 7, exhibits this essential opposition between the wisdom of God in the gospel and that of man as follows: "The preaching of the gospel, therefore, must not be performed in human wisdom; in fact, the latter destroys fundamentally the power of the former because the two (viz. the gospel and human wisdom) are antagonistic elements, admitting of no union; one depriving the other of its nature, and each striving to annihilate the other. Where, therefore, human wisdom rules, the gospel appears as folly; but where the gospel bears sway (*i. e.* has manifested itself as δύναμις Θεοῦ, the Divine power which takes man captive) there human wisdom appears as foolishness, and the preaching of the cross as genuine wisdom. . . . In this view, the gospel has and ever retains the nature of a mystery which the Almighty has prepared for man from the foundation of the world."

Olshausen's Commentary, American Edition, Vol. IV. pp. 213, 223.

and the answer is the same, Because He so loved us. Evidently nothing beyond this, as a manifestation of the love of God, is conceivable. And He so loved us while we were yet in our sins—sinners against Him and enemies of His authority, character and person; else He could not consistently lay it upon us as a duty to love our enemies. Hence, also, it is written: "God commendeth His love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us... When we were enemies, we were reconciled unto God by the death of His Son."

Moreover, it is through this manifestation alone that salvation from our sins reaches us. For when we come to believe in the love which is thus revealed, not only is our own wisdom recognized and renounced as nothing better than folly, but also the delusion which has its source in our alienation from God, that He is alienated from us and has become our enemy, is scattered to the winds; and that fear which springs from our conscious guilt, and drives us away from the Divine presence into deeper and deeper alienation and enmity, is banished from our hearts. Thus we are made free and emboldened to return to God in repentance, faith and love, as to the only true source of our life and well-being. Nay, we are, in some sort, sweetly constrained and forced thus to return. For by this manifestation God follows us out into our alienation, rebellion and enmity, and proclaims His love to us there; and thus takes away our fear, melts our hearts, and wins us back to himself, as it were, in spite of ourselves. It is here that we first learn against whom and what manner of love we have sinned. For that He should love us, being innocent, does not seem strange; but that He should never have been alienated in heart from us; that, from the moment when we began to sin against Him, He should have devised a way to save us, should have prepared a sacrificial Victim in His well-beloved Son to bear our sins in His own body on the tree;

this, indeed, is the great mystery and wonder of Divine love in our eyes. Thus He heaps coals of fire upon our heads, and melts our hearts in penitential sorrow for our sins. For this brings out our sin as committed against such love in God, as so unreasonable, inexcusable, malignant, loathsome, abominable, that we cannot choose but repent of it. This reveals such an unfathomable love in the heart of God that, whosoever believes in it, upon him it has an overwhelming, soul-subduing power. It melts the most obdurate heart. It breaks down the most inveterate enmity. Such is the omnipotence of God's goodness and love as revealed in Christ. Hence it is written: "Sin shall not have dominion over you because ye are not under law but under grace... By grace ye are saved." ... 'Behold, the Lord passed by, and a great and strong wind of Divine judgment rent the mountains, and brake in pieces the rocks, and blew upon my guilty soul; but the Lord was not in the wind: and after the wind, an earthquake of Divine wrath, which caused the solid ground to rock under me; but the Lord was not in the earthquake: and after the earthquake, a raging fire of the Divine law was kindled up around me; but the Lord was not in the fire: but, after the fire, a still small voice, which said unto me, I have loved thee with an eternal love, and have redeemed thee by the sacrifice of mine only begotten Son. That was the voice of God; and when I heard it, I wrapped my face in my mantle, and bowed my head, for my God had conquered me; and that which gave Him the victory was His eternal love as revealed in the most holy sacrifice.'

This faith in God's love to us, as manifested in the gift of His Son, is the primary and unfailing source of our love to Him. For although He is infinitely lovely in himself, yet we, with our minds blinded by the alienation of our hearts from Him, do not and cannot discern the glory and beauty of His character, until we come to regard Him

through this assurance of his love to us: "We love him because he first loved us." And this assurance, as we can easily see, must have been given to our first parents in their symbolical clothing by the hand of God in the skins of sacrificial animals. For, as we have seen, the shame of their naked bodies originated in, and thus became the symbol of their inward and spiritual shame of conscious guilt; and their attempt to cover it with a girdle of fig-leaves represented their desire and efforts to disguise, excuse and palliate their sin, to cover the shame of it from God and from themselves. But they needed a better covering than any which they could provide for themselves; for they were still ashamed and afraid, and fled to hide themselves from the Divine presence. The Voice followed them into the depth of their hiding place, and pronounced upon them, notwithstanding all their excuses and palliations, the sentence of the law which they had violated, that sentence of death which St. Paul tells us he had received in himself, and which every one must receive upon the Adam in him when and wheresoever God reaches him with the condemnation of the Divine law. But, now, this sentence having been pronounced upon them, God gives them a sign and token of His grace and love by clothing them in the skins of sacrificial animals—a striking symbol of the way He has prepared for their salvation; which, together with the promise that the Seed of the woman should crush the serpent's head, makes an end of their delusion that He is their enemy, and convinces them of the tenderness of His fatherly heart towards them. For thus it is declared to them in words and by act more significant and expressive than any words, that He has determined not to leave them in their sin and ruin; that their great enemy shall not finally triumph over them, though they have put themselves under his power; that his head shall be crushed by the Seed of the woman herself, who has been first in the transgression. But they must seek no more to excuse or

palliate their sin by devices of their own minds; for all that they can devise or do for this object must forever prove in vain, of no more avail than their girdle of fig-leaves to cover their shame. They must lay bare the nakedness and shame of their souls to the searching scrutiny of God. He must judge the evil that is in them in order to destroy it out of them. He alone can effectually cover their shame and take away their fear. Nor can He do this in any way comprehensible to their minds. Their sin cannot be put away by any means which their wisdom would choose. An innocent victim must suffer in their stead. This is foolishness in their eyes, because their wisdom is foolishness with God. It demands the submission of their minds to the wisdom of God. And He has provided the victim to bear their sin and carry their transgression. He clothes them in the skins of sacrificial animals, the most impervious, substantial and durable material, in sign and token, that the covering which He provides for sin and shame is complete and perfect, an everlasting righteousness, which once and forever takes away the shame and fear which drive deluded souls away from His presence and from life. And these robes of righteousness He provides for them not otherwise than by the sacrifice of innocent animals to symbolize and signify that the righteousness which only can cover the sin of man must be found in the sacrifice of the innocent for the guilty, even of "the Lamb that was slain from the foundation of the world." Thus He said to our first parents, as He says to all sinful souls: Be no longer ashamed nor afraid, nor fly to hide yourselves from my presence; but return to me in filial confidence, love and obedience; for I am your heavenly Father, and have covered your nakedness and shame.

There are innumerable significant allusions both in the Old and New Testaments to this symbolical transaction, which cannot be understood without constant reference to it. These are such as the following: "He that covereth

his own sins shall not prosper. . . . Woe to the rebellious . . . that cover with a covering, but not of my Spirit, that they may add sin to sin. . . . Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. . . . Thou wast naked and bare; I passed by and spread my skirt over thee, and covered thy nakedness. . . . Thou hast covered all their sins. . . . He hath covered me with the robe of righteousness. . . . I counsel thee to buy of me white raiment that thou mayest be clothed, that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear." Now, it seems very strange that sin should thus be represented as needing to be covered. But when we discern in all such allusions their pointed reference to its shamefulness, and to the manner in which God covered the nakedness of the first sinners, and manifested unto them His forgiving love and fatherly tenderness, these expressions become perfectly natural, and exceedingly expressive of the deliverance of the human soul from conscious guilt and shame and fear through the merit and righteousness and most holy sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ.

XII

THE EXPULSION FROM PARADISE

And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us to know good and evil: and now lest he put forth his hand and take of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever—Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken. So He drove out the man, and He placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim and a flaming sword which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life.

It has been already observed, that, in no intelligible or conceivable sense, was man rendered more like God by sinning than he was before, because the whole effect of his sin must have been to mutilate and deface that image or likeness of his Maker in which he was created. What, then, are we to understand by these words of God: "Behold, the man is become as one of us to know good and evil"? There is but one possible solution of this difficulty, which is, that the words be interpreted by the figure of speech called solemn irony, the force of which is, that the meaning of the ironical expression is precisely the opposite of its literal import. But as this may be regarded, in the present case, as a bold procedure, it becomes necessary to warrant it by exhibiting the not infrequent use which is made of this figure in the Scriptures, and even by our Lord himself.

We call attention, then, in the first place, to the famous ironical address of the prophet Elijah to the priests of Baal. For after they had sacrificed, "and called on the name of Baal from morning until noon, saying, O Baal, hear us, but there was no voice, nor any that answered. . . .

it came to pass at noon that Elijah mocked them, and said, Cry aloud, for he is a god! Either he is talking, or he is pursuing [gone a-hunting] or he is on a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked!" Here, now, the prophet evidently means to express the precise opposite of the literal import of his words, namely, that Baal was no god at all; and this meaning he enforces by attributing to him such employments and recreations, and in these such entire pre-occupation of mind, as prevented him from attending to the prayers of his deluded worshippers; all which is absurdly inconsistent with the notion of his divinity. In this way the prophet pours out his righteous indignation upon these misleaders and corrupters of the people, and exposes the grossness of their folly and stupidity more eloquently and with greater severity than were otherwise possible.

In like manner Solomon, using the same figure, exhorts the young to give themselves up to levity and excess in the enjoyment of earthly pleasure, and to the folly of allowing themselves to be guided by their own wisdom, which, as we have seen, was the original sin itself: "Rejoice, O young man in thy youth, and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thy heart and in the sight of thine eyes; but know that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment." Now, the former part of this address is evidently ironical, but in the latter part the irony is dropped, as is commonly the case, in order to guard against misunderstanding. The meaning of the whole is: Rejoice not, O young man, in these vain and transitory pleasures; walk not in the ways of thine own heart, nor in the sight of thine own eyes, *i. e.*, follow not thine earthly desires, nor thine own wisdom, as the guide of thy life, since for all these things God will surely bring thee to a terrible reckoning.

Moreover, in the Holy Scriptures, God is frequently represented as rebuking sin by solemn mockery of its folly,

inasmuch as it consists in man's rejection of the Divine wisdom, and in the preference of his own, in the choice between good and evil; and this, even where irony, which is the most expressive figure for such mockery, does not appear. Thus, in the words of the heavenly Wisdom: "Because I have called and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded; but ye have set at naught all my counsel, and would none of my reproof; I also will laugh at your calamity, I will mock when your fear cometh; when your fear cometh as desolation, and your destruction cometh as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish cometh upon you." It is true that to the sentimentality which now so generally prevails such representations may seem harsh, but the only point to be established here is, that they are Scriptural; and it is certain that in no other way could the folly of sin be so clearly exhibited and so powerfully emphasized.

Again, by the Psalmist, the folly of the nations and their rulers in rebellion against God is held up as an object of Divine derision: "Why do the nations rage, and the peoples imagine vanity? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord, and against His Anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision."

But it is still more worthy of remark that our Lord Jesus Christ himself sometimes resorts to this figure of irony as being necessary to the best expression of His ideas and sentiments. Thus, when on His return from His agony in Gethsemane, after having in the most solemn and tender manner requested His disciples to watch and pray with Him through His dark hour, He found them asleep, He said: "Sleep on now and take your rest; behold, the hour is at hand, and the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners: rise, and let us be going; be-

hold, he is at hand which doth betray me." Now here there are three things to be observed: 1. If He had intended them to remain asleep, according to the literal import of His words, He would hardly have addressed them in a speech which, in order to have any effect at all upon their minds, must have awakened them. 2. In the latter part of His address He gives precisely the same reason for their awaking which, in the former part and in the same breath, He had given for their continuing to sleep, namely, the imminence of His betrayal, and which, if it had been a good reason for the one, could not have been for the other. 3. In order that it might be impossible to mistake His meaning, in the latter part of the address He drops the figure and expresses himself literally, commanding His disciples to awake, and be ready for the shocking event which was about to take place. The whole is as if He had said: This is, indeed, a time for you to be sleeping, when your Lord and Saviour is about to be betrayed and crucified! Rise, and let us be going, for the betrayer is just at hand.

In like manner, the whole parable of the unjust steward is certainly a strain of terrible irony, although, in default of those inflections of the living voice by which, no doubt, it was interpreted to those who heard it delivered, it does not seem to have been subsequently recognized as such. The evidence on this point, however, must be placed in a footnote.* In a number of instances, also,

* The literal interpretation of this parable is involved in insuperable difficulties, and the positive evidence of its ironical character is such as leaves nothing to desire, except the interpreting power of the living voice, and even without this it is demonstrative. For this steward is called to account by his lord for having wasted his goods, and is about to be deprived of his office: whereupon, in order to make provision for himself, he conspires with his lord's debtors to defraud him, and his lord commends him "because he had done wisely." Now, here, several things are to be observed, as, 1. That no master ever thought of commending or praising a servant for any wisdom exercised in defrauding himself. Masters have quite other thoughts and sentiments when they discover such roguery in

similar ironical passages occur in the writings of the apostle Paul.

Now, with such frequent use of this figure in the Scriptures, we are fully warranted and authorized in applying it to whatever in this mysterious passage may require it, in order to yield an intelligible sense. And it is a matter of thankfulness that, for such application of it here, we have the authority of two of the greatest names in the whole history of the church. For St. Augustine, interpreting the words, "Behold, the man has become as one of us," says: "God does not concede that man had become like himself; but He upbraids him with his failure.... Not only did man not become that to which he aspired, but he lost that [likeness of God] in which he had been

their servants. Literally interpreted, therefore, the parable is manifestly and grossly untrue to nature, whilst absolute truth to nature is one of the most distinguishing and beautiful traits of all the other parables of our Lord. 2. There is absolutely nothing in the conduct of this steward which properly can be commended, or held up as a model for imitation; least of all, that which has been commonly supposed, namely, his prudence, or foresight. For there is no more of these qualities here than in any other case in which an agent defrauds his principal, and is caught in the act. This superlative fool, who is too lazy to work and too proud to beg, has not wit enough to conceal his roguery—it is all found out—nor can it be supposed that either he, or his joint-conspirators, were allowed to retain the fruits of their roguery, after it was all detected. Now, what wisdom, or prudence, or foresight is discernible in all this more than in any other case of transparent and detected fraud? 3. The words, as properly rendered in the authorized version, are: "And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail they may receive you into everlasting habitations." Now, when shall the disciples of Christ fail? When shall they have need of anything that the mammon of unrighteousness can supply them with? And where did the mammon of unrighteousness get everlasting habitations to give them? These questions necessarily arise out of the literal interpretation of these words, and they admit of no rational answer. 4. But if the parable be interpreted by the figure of solemn irony, all these difficulties vanish, and the whole clears up at once. For thus we have, as the true sense of the words, "And the Lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely; for the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light," the following: Surely your Lord will commend you for unfaithfulness in matters of trust, if you can conceive it possible

created." Each of these statements necessarily implies that Augustine understood the words in an ironical sense. Venerable Bede, also, or Bæda, as it seems we must now call him, expressly declares that he so understood them. For, after giving the above citations from Augustine, he quotes and comments as follows: "'Behold, Adam has become as one of us,' just as the apostle, where he says: 'Forgive me this wrong,' certainly means to be understood in the contrary sense." Thus interpreted, the true sense of these words may be given in the following paraphrase: Behold how man has attained the object of his insane aspiration to become equal to us in ability to discern between good and evil by his own wisdom, and that, by committing sin, which has defaced and well-nigh destroyed our like-

that any master should praise his servant for such roguery as this! And it will be wise for you to imitate this rogue's example, if it be so, that the children of darkness are wiser in their evil generation than the children of light, who are guided by the wisdom which is from above! 5. But the crowning proof of the irony of the parable lies in the application which the Lord himself makes of it, where, dropping the figure lest He should be misunderstood, He proceeds to warn his disciples, in the most direct and pointed manner, against this unjust steward's example, and to hold it up to utter reprobation. For, in palpable reference to his folly, no less than to his iniquity, He now declares: "He that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much. If, therefore, ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon [as this man was not], who shall commit to your trust the true riches? [*i. e.* the everlasting habitations]. And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's [as this steward was not], who shall give you that which is your own? . . . Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Thus we see that this much misunderstood parable, as interpreted by the Lord himself, holds up the character and conduct of the steward, who was no less fool than rogue, as the very opposite of true wisdom, and as, in every respect, to be reprobated and abhorred—that it was not spoken to recommend prudence or foresight, but against that covetousness or greed of worldly wealth which is the parent of all breaches of trust, and of all forms of cheating and stealing. 6. Finally, this interpretation is abundantly confirmed by what is immediately added: "And the Pharisees who were covetous heard all these things, and they derided Him." For they plainly perceived that the parable was spoken against them. And this led Him to follow them up with another, that of the Rich Man and Lazarus, which is directed against the same earthly and sensual greed.

ness in his soul! This figure governs, also, the interpretation of the words which immediately follow: "And, now, lest he put forth his hand, and take of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever." For although it has been supposed by some that this tree contained a physical virtue by which the natural life of man would have been indefinitely prolonged, so that death would have been unknown, yet, as he certainly did not obtain the incommunicable power of independent discrimination and choice between good and evil by eating of the forbidden tree, so it is rationally inconceivable that he could have attained to immortality in sin and guilt by eating of the tree of life. Hence these words also must be taken in an ironical sense, as expressive of God's view of man's unutterable folly, in that he had forfeited his immortality, so that not even the tree of life could restore it. Nor is this inconsistent with what immediately follows: "Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken." For this word "Therefore" in the Hebrew is simply the conjunction "And;" in fact, it ought to have been so rendered here. But if the present rendering be retained, which it may bear, it connects what follows, not with the words which immediately precede it, but with the whole previous transaction of the sin and fall of man, for which, evidently, as the all-controlling reason, he was expelled from the blissful abode of his innocence.

Further, it is to be observed, that the paradise in which our first parents had hitherto lived, and which had been to them the symbol and outward reflection of their innocent and happy life, could not be a suitable abode for their sinful nature, upon which had come the judgments of labor and sorrow and death. From this they must needs be excluded; and it was even more necessary that they should now be prohibited from eating of that sacred tree which was the sacrament and symbol of their obedience by their own agency to the authoritative guidance of the wis-

dom of God, not lest they should thereby attain to immortality in sin, which is inconceivable, but because they had forfeited forever all claim to the blessings which it represented, and, for them to touch it with their polluted hands, would be a profanation of holy things. Also, they needed to be powerfully instructed and admonished that their life of innocence, now lost, could never be recovered; that it would be worse than in vain for them to linger around that tree, longing to retrace their steps and to undo what could never be undone; that they must now go forth into a world full of thorns and thistles, and must submit themselves to all the evils which they have brought upon themselves by their sin, in order that they may learn by bitter experience how inadequate to distinguish between good and evil is the guide of life which they have chosen, and may have their minds wholly turned to that new way of being saved from their sins which has been symbolically opened before them in the sacrifice of the innocent animals, in whose skins they have now been clothed by the hand of God. In these considerations we must find the true reasons for what is expressed in the words: "And the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken: and He drove out the man, and placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim and a flaming sword which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life."

The question now comes before us, what is there in all this which is of universal significance? What are the truths for man as such which are here represented or symbolized?

Let us observe, then, that the life of man hitherto had been one of perfect innocence by the obedience of his own agency, in which he was fully justified by the works of the law to which he was amenable. But now that life was lost, so that it could never be recovered. For innocence, once lost, can never be restored, because it consists in never

having sinned. The saints in glory, who "have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb," are not and never can become innocent, for it can never be true that they have not sinned. Hence the truth for man as such which is here symbolized is, that he can never regain his lost spiritual life by the obedience of his own agency—can never again be justified by his works under the Divine law. That way of life is forever closed up against him, and all his efforts in that direction must forever prove worse than in vain.

The principal reasons why this is so are the following: First, that which has just been given, namely, that, in the nature of the case, innocence, once lost, can never be regained. The second is, that sin, as elsewhere we have seen, requires an atonement in which the innocent must suffer for the guilty, and which self-evidently the sinner cannot make for his own sins. But this truth has been sufficiently exhibited in previous connections, and need not be further developed here. The third reason is, that sin defiles, perverts, depraves, corrupts and renders diseased the moral nature and faculties of the sinner, and thus vitiates all his subsequent agency, so that he is no longer capable of rendering thereby an acceptable obedience to the Divine law. It defiles the inmost spiritual nature of the agent himself, which is the source of all his acts, whether of thought, affection, or will, and thus defiles all the streams which flow from this fountain. It perverts the nature of the vine, and hence all the branches and fruits of the vine are perverted. It corrupts the heart out of which are the issues of life, and hence the whole life is corrupted. It paralyzes the spiritual will, which is the inmost centre of personality, and hence all that depends upon the will is vitiated. And it blinds the intellect to the discernment and knowledge of invisible, supersensual, spiritual and Divine things, whence it becomes filled with errors and delusions. In fine, this reflex influence of sin,

as we have seen, renders the sinner, left to his own agency, ever more and more sinful; it originates a progress in corruption which, left to itself, naturally runs on forever.

Now, whatever metaphysical objection may be urged against this doctrine of sin, there is no doubt but that it is perfectly Scriptural. For everywhere in the Word it is either assumed, or explicitly taught, that sin is not that alone which depends upon the sinner's own moral actions, and for which he is personally and individually responsible. This notion connects itself with an undue and over-development of the principle of individualism in modern times. It leaves out of view the substantial unity of human nature, and the organic relations of individuals with each other in families, communities, nations and the race itself, whereby children become partakers of the good and evil of their parents, and all men of the sin which originated in him from whom they are descended. Consequently, it does not exhaust the Scriptural conception of sin, which represents it as an inherited spiritual disease, a malady, a poison, such that it is not forgiveness alone which the sinful soul needs, though that be indispensable, but also spiritual healing, the restoration of the health of the soul. For Christ represents himself, not only as expiating human guilt, and obtaining forgiveness for men, but also as the great and only Physician of the soul. Thus, in the words which He applies to himself: "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." Also His miracles of physical healing have always been recognized as symbols and manifestations of His vocation and power to heal the soul of the malady of sin.

This doctrine of sin runs through the whole Scripture from beginning to end, and is often expressed, as in such passages as the following: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me... Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one."

But it stands out most prominently, as might be expected, in the writings of the apostle Paul, from which a multitude of statements in proof might be cited, many of which admit of no other intelligible meaning. Among these are the following: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. For until the law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed where there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression... By one man's offense death reigned. ... Through the offense of one many be dead... In Adam all die... By the offense of one judgment came upon all men unto condemnation... By one man's disobedience many were made sinners... I was alive without the law once, but when the commandment came sin revived, and I died... Sin taking occasion by the commandment deceived me, and by it slew me... wrought in me all manner of concupiscence." Now it seems impossible fairly to interpret such declarations as these without recognizing that what is here called "sin" is a moral corruption in the agent himself which lies back of all his moral actions, and from which they all do proceed.

This last reason, if there were no other, is enough to evince that it is utterly impossible for the sinner to be justified by his own works, to return to spiritual life, to secure his own salvation, by his own agency. Man cannot save himself. The delusion that this is somehow possible is the heart and substance of that which St. Paul so strenuously combats under the form of justification by the works of the law: and he is thus strenuous and impassioned, because it is one of the hardest of all things for the sinner to become convinced that, although some of his sins may be "more heinous in the sight of God than others," it is impossible for him, in his own strength, to do anything which is not tainted and defiled with sin, or which does not bring him

still more under the Divine displeasure. Yet it is indispensable to his salvation that he should be brought to despair of his own agency. For without this he remains blind to the knowledge of what that is from which he needs to be saved, and of what salvation truly is. Hence he looks to Christ as having procured forgiveness for him, rather than as his Saviour from sin itself. He thinks that, if he will do about as well as he can, the Lord will forgive him for matters of human infirmity wherein he may come short of his whole duty. But as well might one whose vitals a cancer is eating away be satisfied with a surgeon who removes some of its branches, or mitigates its symptoms, and tells him that he will forgive him the operation necessary to eradicate it from his system. Such forgiveness can do him no good—the disease will destroy him all the same. Also, in this delusion, the sinner is always striving to excuse himself, to convince himself and others that he is not so very much to blame. As well might he try to excuse himself for having taken poison—such excuses can give him no relief—what he needs is an antidote. Excuse, or even pardon itself for all his transgressions, though announced to him by the voice of God from heaven, cannot benefit him in the least without the reconciliation of his heart to God in love, and the purification and renovation of his spiritual nature—without the restoration of the perfect image of God in his soul. And whenever such forgiveness becomes the chief object of desire and seeking, to the exclusion of deliverance from sin itself, it is made an idol which can hardly fail to bring its deluded worshipper "to shame and everlasting contempt."

Until the sinner is brought to despair of his own agency, to feel that he is indeed "without strength," and is thus emptied of self-righteousness and self-trust, which is only another word for self-conceit, he is always lingering at the gate of paradise, from which he has been irrecoverably expelled, striving in vain to re-enter it, to return to the

tree of life, that he may save himself by eating of its fruit. Hence he is in no wise prepared, or in a state of mind in which it is possible for him to receive that new life which is already prepared for him, and which is exhibited to our faith in such declarations as the following: "The Lord our righteousness.... In the Lord have I righteousness and strength.... Ye are in Christ who has been made unto us wisdom from God and righteousness and sanctification and redemption.... Christ is in you.... The riches of the glory of this mystery.... which is Christ in you the hope of glory.... Ye are the temple of the living God. ... The Spirit of God dwelleth in you.... I am the vine, ye are the branches.... Ye are the body of Christ.... If any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of His.... He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit [with Him].... It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure.... Because I live ye shall live also.... I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.... It is not I that live, but Christ that liveth in me."

Now the spiritual life which is represented in a vast multitude of such Scriptures as these is different from, and immeasurably exalted above that of man's original innocence; wherein we have, in part at least, the fulfilment of the declaration: "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." For that life of innocence depended upon man's own agency, in which he was created mutable and fallible, so that it could be, as it was, forfeited and lost: whereas this new life depends not at all upon the fallibility of man's discernment between good and evil, nor upon the mutability of his will. That way of life was tried with man in his estate of innocence, and even then it failed; much more would it fail now in his fallen and sinful state. The simple guidance of the wisdom of God in choosing between good and evil, having proved itself insufficient in such favorable circumstances, must needs prove much more in-

sufficient now that to follow this guidance man has no strength, no will, no desire. Now he needs a wisdom, a susceptibility, a will, a strength—in one word, an agency —which is not his own, yet united to, revealed in, and become one with his own agency, to choose and obey in and for him. Consequently, this new life is made to depend essentially upon the wisdom and will, the obedience and righteousness—the agency—of Christ in man, wherein He is infallible and immutable, so that this life can never be forfeited nor lost. For it is Christ in man who chooses and obeys for him, of which man's obedience, whether of thought, affection, volition, or act, is the consequence, fruit and manifestation. Thus it is that the Christ of God brings into man his own all-perfect and "everlasting righteousness."

Here, now, we have brought out the grand significance of the "new covenant," as distinguished from that relation to God under which man lived in innocence, and from all forms and stages of the legal dispensation inaugurated through the mediation of Moses. It is to this that David refers in his last words as follows: "He hath made an everlasting covenant with me ordered in all things and sure;" and this is the meaning of a vast multitude of other Scriptural deliverances, such as the following: "I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David.... I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them to do them good.... not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers ... which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith the Lord.... But I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.... I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts.... and they shall not depart from me.... And I will be their God, and they shall be my people.... Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his

counsel, confirmed it by an oath. . . . And because He could swear by none greater, He sware by himself. . . . That by two immutable things [His promise and oath] in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation who have fled for refuge to the hope set before us." Then, as if He could never say enough to establish the certainty of these promises of His new covenant, He compares them to the unchangeableness and stability of his ordinances and laws in the natural world. In fine, we must understand that it was in full view of all these promises and counsels of God that our Lord instituted the sacrament of the Holy Supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood which is shed for you; do you all drink of it."

Thus it appears that what renders this new life unchangeably secure to all "the heirs of promise," is what has been called "the mystical union" of their souls with the Lord Jesus Christ. What, then, we must inquire here, is the nature of this union? For although it is one of the most profound and inscrutable mysteries of the gospel, yet we must form some conception of it, however inadequate, in order that it should become an object of our faith.

In answer to this question, there can be no doubt but that this mystical union between the Divine and the human is typically represented by the incarnation, in which God was manifested in the flesh, and became one with man, in the person of Jesus Christ. For believing souls become what they are in and through Him, 'that in all things He may have the pre-eminence;' and He is their elder brother, which includes the truth, that He is of the same species, or oneness of life with them, in which sense it is written: "In all things, it behoved Him to be made like unto his brethren." Hence, as He is "the Son of God," so are they "sons of God" in and through Him; as He partakes of the Divine nature, so are they "partakers of a Divine nature" in Him; as He is one with

God, so are they one with God in Him, in the sense that "he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit" [with Him]; and as "in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," so are they "filled with all the fulness of God" in Him. In fact, almost every expression which is used in the Scriptures to characterize Him is applied to His people as partakers of and one with Him.

This makes it necessary, in order to reach anything like a true conception of this union, that we should here undertake to formulate a Scriptural conception of the mystical person of Christ; and for this purpose we must take into consideration some things which, at first sight, may seem to be remote from the subject.

Let us direct our attention, then, to the obvious fact, that all things which are known to us exist in an ascending series, one rising above another, in ever-increasing complexity and dignity of nature, until we come at last to that noblest and most exalted manifestation of the power and glory of God, "the man Christ Jesus." This series commences, at the lowest term, with matter pure and simple, howsoever matter may be defined, or whatever conception of it may be formed. Next above this, we have the vegetable, which is of a higher degree of complexity and dignity, inasmuch as it is composed of matter with all its properties and laws, together with something of a more exalted nature, namely, the principle of vegetable life, whatever that may be, so that these two are combined in the unity of one and the same superior existence. At the next stage we have the animal, which is of a still higher degree of complexity and dignity, being composed of all that there is in the vegetable, *i. e.*, matter and plant-life, together with something still superior, namely, the principle of animal life, including capacities of pleasure and pain, a certain form of consciousness, and some of the lower mental faculties, so that these two become one in the unity of the same creature. Next above the mere animal,

in this scale of being, is man, as he came from the hands of his Maker, and as he still exists, in whom we have a yet higher degree of complexity and dignity. For man contains in himself the whole animal nature—its senses, capacities, faculties, appetites and passions—in union with a human soul endowed with reason and free-will, capable of the distinction between right and wrong, of the knowledge of God, of the spiritual world, and of immortality, so that these two are one in the unity of the self-same conscious being. The crowning term of the series, involving the highest degree of complex existence and dignity of nature, is that of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom we must conceive as constituted by the mystical union of God with man in one personality and consciousness, according to the preceding analogies in nature, namely, those of the union of vegetable life with matter, of the animal with the vegetable, and of the human soul with the animal.

Thus we see that, according to this orthodox conception of the person of Christ, He belongs, in a certain sense, to the order of nature, so that, if there had been no such being, the Divine idea which underlies and governs the whole creation would have remained incomplete and unfulfilled. Nor is this conception more orthodox than Scriptural. For it rests upon a vast induction of statements and facts, which, without it, are incapable of being comprehended in harmony with each other. Among these are the following: 1. In the sacred Word there are constantly ascribed to Christ all those names, titles, attributes, works and worship, which, as everywhere represented, it is impious sacrilege to ascribe to any other but the one only living and true God. His prophetic name is "Immanuel, which being interpreted is, God-with-us." He is called "the mighty God, the Father of eternity." He himself claims to 'do the works, and to be honored with the honor of his Father'; and His miracles were such as could be wrought by no other but the power of God.

Now, all this is incomprehensible with any other conception of Him than that of His essential and supreme divinity. 2. In closest connection with these statements, it stands recorded that He was born of a woman; that He "increased in wisdom and stature"; that He ate, drank, and slept; that He was tempted to sin; that He wept, suffered and died: all which is incomprehensible with any other conception of Him than that of His true and proper humanity. Hence the necessity of a more general conception which shall combine these two in one; and the only such conception which is possible to the human mind is that which we reach through the preceding analogies of the union of diverse elements in the same forms of complex existence; namely, that Christ was both God and man, in the full consciousness of both these elements of His personality. Nor is there in all this even the appearance of an inconsistency. 3. Accordingly, we find Him in the gospel record constantly manifesting this dual consciousness both of His Divine and of His human natures, as entering into the constitution of His one and indivisible personality. Thus He expresses his God-consciousness in a multitude of such declarations as the following: "I and my Father are one.... Before Abraham was I am"; and in all His miracles: also He expresses His consciousness of being a man in all such as these: "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but my Father only.... Ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth"; and in all His merely human actions. At the same time, He uses the personal pronoun I, as representing and expressing the indivisible unity of His person and consciousness, the one subject of both these different classes of acts and experiences, alike with respect to those which proceed from His divinity and those which proceed from His humanity. He says, I do this, alike when He is working the most stupendous miracles, and when He is talking or eating with his disci-

ples, or walking the streets of Jerusalem. Nor should this seem strange to us, since we have in our own experience what enables us to comprehend it. For we also have a similar dual consciousness from the fact, that we are similarly constituted of two diverse elements, namely, of both a material and a spiritual nature, in consequence of which we say, I feel hunger, thirst, physical pain and pleasure, all which have their seat in, and proceed from our material nature; and, I feel remorse, reverence, awe, love to God, and the assurance of immortality, all which belong exclusively to our spiritual nature. Thus we express our consciousness that what we designate by the personal pronoun I, namely, our personality, which is the subject of both these classes of diverse experiences, is one and indivisible. 4. Sometimes, moreover, one form of this dualism seems to predominate in the consciousness of Christ, and sometimes the other, which also we are enabled to comprehend from our own experience. For we may be in such an agony of physical pain as to overshadow and almost, or quite, extinguish the consciousness of our spiritual and immortal nature, and we may be in such rapture of spiritual exaltation and vision of spiritual things that the objects of sense will disappear, and physical pain, however severe, will cease to be felt. The saints and martyrs appear to have experienced this latter state, what time they were "in the spirit," and 'heard unspeakable words which it was not lawful for a man to utter, not knowing whether they were in or out of the body,' and when they stood in the midst of the flames with radiant countenances. Thus, also, our Lord seems to express only the consciousness of His Divine nature in the scenes of His transfiguration, and in the words already referred to: "Before Abraham was I am"; whilst this Divine consciousness seems to be overshadowed, and thrown into the back-ground, by that of his feeble, dependent and suffering humanity, as expressed in the words: "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto

death", and when, in the agony of the cross, He cried out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

Now, this discernment of the person of Christ, in whom His people are typically represented, will enable us to comprehend, at least in an equal degree, the mystery of their union with God in Him. We must observe, however, that it is expressed in different ways, as being with Christ immediately, or mediately through the indwelling of His Holy Spirit. Sometimes these two ideas are given separately, as in the words: "If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall quicken your mortal bodies also through that Spirit which dwelleth in you.... Know ye not your own selves [Are ye so ignorant of what ye yourselves are as not to know] how that Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates." In other passages they seem to be synthesized, as in the following case: "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now, if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His: and if the Spirit of Christ be in you, the body is dead unto sin, but the Spirit is life unto righteousness." In fact these two forms of expression are hardly distinguishable from each other as to their practical significance; and they may easily be combined in one conception, namely, that of the union of the soul with the Holy Spirit, and thereby with Christ himself, to whom that Spirit was given without measure. Thus, as the natural or Adamic man is constituted by the vital union of the animal nature with a human soul, so we must conceive of the new or spiritual man as constituted in his personality by the vital union of the Spirit of God and of Christ with his soul, so that these two become one, as the branches are one with the vine, as the members of a human body are one with their head, and as the body itself is one with its soul.

Further, this union is copiously illustrated in the Scrip-

tures by various images and analogies, such as those which have just been referred to. One of these is that of marriage, where the church is represented as "the Bride, the Lamb's wife . . . adorned for her husband;" and as in the words of St. Paul: "The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church. Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands. . . . Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it. . . . For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. . . . This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the church." Now this image is frequently employed in the Old Testament to exhibit the relation which then subsisted between God and his people; for which reason, and because it represents important practical consequences, it seems to have been carried over into the new dispensation. But inasmuch as it is common to both dispensations, we shall find it altogether inadequate to set forth the final perfection of that oneness of Christ with his people which is consummated in and through his incarnation, and the indwelling in them of His Holy Spirit in such fulness as was never before known. For such expression of it, we must look mainly to those analogies which are peculiar to the New Testament.

The first of these is given us in the words of the Lord: "I am the true vine: . . . ye are the branches. . . . Abide in me and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in me. . . . He that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit. For without me ye can do nothing." All this is very significant. For the life of the branches is not only similar to, and derived from, but it is numerically and identically one and the same with that of the vine, which implies that this union between Christ and his people is such that their spiritual life is not barely similar to, and derived from, but that it

is altogether one and the same with His life. The very life of Christ itself flows into and lives in them. Hence the force of his reasoning in that peculiar form of expression: "Because I live ye shall live also."

Another of these analogies is contained in the union which subsists between the human head and its body, as in the statements: "The head of every man is Christ.... Christ is the head of the church, and himself is the Saviour of the body.... And He hath given Him to be the head over all things to the church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." Still another is that of the union of the body with its members: "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ.... Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." Both of these images are frequently employed, and to the development and application of them St. Paul devotes the whole of a long chapter in his first epistle to the Corinthians. They exhibit the same unity of life in Christ and his people which is so graphically pictured in that of the vine and its branches; and, therefore, we may pass them without further comment, in order to consider more particularly that which is to follow.

For there is yet another image to which we must give special attention, namely, that of the union of the soul and body, as contained in the words: "There is one Spirit and one body," and in all those passages which have been sufficiently exhibited in the examples previously cited, in which the Lord's people are represented as His body, and He as their indwelling and animating Spirit. The significance of these becomes apparent when we consider that, as the human body is not so solid or dense as to exclude the soul from any of its organs or members, so the very substance of the soul itself is not so dense or solid but that, in all its faculties and their functions, it can be permeated, animated, inspired and actuated by the Spirit of God.

And this is just what takes place in this mystical union between Christ and His people. What the soul is to the body of the natural man, Christ is to the soul of the spiritual man; as the soul in the body, so Christ in the soul.

This is true of all the different faculties or powers of the soul, so that when the union is perfected, it becomes "filled with all the fulness of God." 1. Thus, the intellectual faculties are illuminated with the knowledge and wisdom of Christ, "who is made unto us wisdom from God," with respect to the things of the invisible and spiritual world, and, especially, the things which pertain to himself as our Saviour. These are no longer dim, shadowy, uncertain, as they are to the natural man; but they have now a clearness and certainty, an all-controlling and life-moulding power, unknown before. In fact, all things are now seen, not with the man's own eyes, but, so to speak, through the eyes of Christ, in the light in which He sees them, and as He represents them in His word. Thus are fulfilled such promises and declarations as the following: "The Paraclete, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you.... When He, the Spirit of truth, is come,... He shall guide you into all the truth.... He shall receive of mine, and shall disclose it unto you.... Ye have an anointing from the Holy One, and ye know all things.... The anointing which ye have received from Him abideth in you, and ye have no need that any one teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you concerning all things, and is true and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, abide ye in Him.... We have the mind [νοῦν] of Christ." 2. In like manner, through this union, the spiritual man is made a partaker of the susceptibilities and affections of Christ; is moved by what moves Him, affected by what affects Him, feels as He feels, loves what He loves, and hates what He hates; in which sense it is written: "The love of God is

shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.... Ye are partakers of the sufferings of Christ.... I rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church." 3. In fine, the will of Christ unites itself and becomes one with the human will, so that the acts of the two, in the degree in which this union is perfected, are indistinguishable from each other in the consciousness. The man is conscious of his own will, as distinct from his Lord's, in so far only as it is manifested in self-assertion and insubordination of the human to the Divine. Thus the volitions and actions of the new man are literally those of the will of Christ in him. Hence the exhortation of the holy apostle: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure."

The practical consequences of this mystical union between Christ and our souls cannot be less than of supreme importance. In fact, our whole salvation, both our justification and sanctification, and "all things which pertain to life and godliness," depend upon and proceed from it.

With respect to our justification, it has been defined in all the reformed communions substantially alike, as "an act of God's free grace, wherein He pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in His sight only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone;" and commonly it has been explained in the sense that we are regarded and treated as being righteous in virtue of Christ's righteousness imputed to us as if it were our own. But this has always been a stumbling-block to thoughtful people, who could not help asking, how is it conceivable that God, who only sees all things as they are, should regard us as being, in point of righteousness, altogether different from what we are? How can the righteousness of one be imputed to another, as if

it were his own? Now the preceding analogies suggest something in our own experience which enables us to answer these questions and to solve these difficulties. For we do not regard, nor treat, nor even think of a vegetable organism with respect to the lower element of its nature, the mere matter which enters into its composition, but we regard, treat and think of it with reference to the higher element of its complex nature—as being truly and properly a vegetable. In like manner, we do not treat an animal as being in part composed of a vegetable, but altogether according to the higher element of its nature; it is the object of our thoughts simply as an animal. Nor do we think of a man with reference to the animal which he contains in himself, but we characterize him by, and treat him according to the nobler element of his complex nature, as a being endowed with reason and free-will. If we should do otherwise, we should account ourselves as irrational; for he who treats a man as if he were an animal is himself a brute. And, in all this, we think and act according to the image or likeness of God in which we are created; for this is just what God does in the matter of our justification; He regards and treats us, not according to our lower and sinful nature, but according to 'the Divine nature of which we are partakers.' He does not impute sin to us, because this is confined to our lower nature; but He imputes to us the merits and righteousness of Christ, because Christ is in us, and has become one with us. He sees only Christ in us because Christ is in us, and one with us; which determines our true character and standing before Him, just as we see only the vegetable, the animal, the man, the nobler and characteristic elements in these complex existences. It is only in this way that we can comprehend St. Paul where he boldly identifies himself with the new man, and relegates his remaining sinfulness to his flesh, his members, as in the following sublime passage: "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh,

dwelleth no good thing.... For that which I do, I allow not.... But what I hate, that I do.... If, then, I do that which I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.... For I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin in my members.... So, then, with the mind I myself serve the law of God." Here, also, we discern the meaning of those puzzling words of the beloved disciple: "Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not.... Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, because His seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."

But St. Paul could not rest in mere justification—he still regarded himself as chained to a dead body—whilst this law of sin remained in his members. Hence he cries out, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" and he answers his own question in the words: "I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord [I shall be delivered]." Here, then, with respect to our sanctification, we must observe, that it depends upon, and proceeds from, our union with Christ, no less than our justification. For it is only through this that 'He is made unto us righteousness and sanctification and redemption.' Thus only are the perfections of His character and life reproduced in us, and we become partakers of His holiness. Thus, not only do His views of all things become our views, but His love of the truth becomes love of the truth in us; His faith, faith in us; His meekness and submission to His Father's will, meekness and submission to the Father's will in us; His strength to resist temptation, strength to resist temptation in us; His obedience and righteousness, obedience and righteousness in us; His unselfishness and self-sacrifice, unselfishness and self-sacrifice in us; His love to God and man, love to God and man in us; His holiness, holiness in us; and His immortality and

glory, immortality and glory in us. Such is the grand significance of the declaration which the beloved disciple makes in the commencement of his gospel: "Of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace;" and thus is accomplished the glorious object for which He came into the world, as stated by the prophet Daniel, "To finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for inquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness."

Such, then, is the new relation of the believing soul to God in Christ, and such is the immutable security of the new life which rests upon and proceeds from it. Hence this new life required very different symbols and sacraments from those which were appropriate to man's former life of innocence and obedience by his own agency in choosing between good and evil. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil and the tree of life, the sacraments of that lost life, would now be altogether inappropriate and misleading. From the moment in which he sinned, man must look to very different symbols of the way in which only it is now possible that he should be saved. In the agony and shed blood of the innocent victim, in its flesh consumed by fire upon the altar of God, in the washing with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, in eating and drinking bread and wine as emblems of the body and blood of Christ broken and shed for him, given unto and received by him, and inseparably identified with him—in these symbols he must now find represented his spiritual baptism into the death of Christ unto sin, and his resurrection unto the new life of Christ in him, so that he may be able to say with Paul: "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh is by the faith of the Son of God." For, in order to his reception of this new life, every hope resting on the obedience of his own agency must be rooted out of his

heart, otherwise he will not and cannot humble himself to receive salvation by the obedience and righteousness of another for and in him. It is only upon the crushed ruins of his own agency that the temple of this new life can be edified in his soul. Hence, when he committed his first sin, he was powerfully warned against all attempts to return to the life he had irrecoverably lost, by the cherubim and flaming sword which were placed at the entrance of the garden of Eden "to keep the way of the tree of life;" and by that flaming sword must every one, from that day to this, who seeks to be justified by his own works, to walk by his own light, to obey by his own agency, to live by his own life, be slain and consumed.

Thus, we see, in fine, that the immutable security of this new life results from the fact that it does not depend on man's fallible agency in the discrimination and choice between good and evil, but on that of Him who has become one with His people, and whose wisdom cannot err, whose faith cannot fail, and whose spiritual strength is adequate to all emergencies. And this may enable us to understand why it is that, when this symbol of the tree of life appears once more at the close of the Apocalyptic conflicts—the humanity now saved from all sin—it stands in the midst of the New Jerusalem, on the banks of the river of life, which flows forth eternally out of the throne of God and the Lamb, and there stands beside it no longer, as in the paradise of man's innocence, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

XIII

THE HOLY SABBATH

And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made: and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made: and God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made.

THE institution of the Sabbath, as here represented in the Mosaic record of the creation, has given rise to many questions of great and permanent interest, some of which hardly admit of answers that can be regarded as altogether satisfactory. One very serious difficulty is involved in the reason here given for the sanctification of the seventh day, namely, that in it God rested after His six days' work of creation, which seems to imply that these six days were similar in kind and length to the seventh. For otherwise how could the seven days be enumerated together without a violation of the necessary laws of analytic thought? Yet no person of intelligence now believes that the world was actually created in six literal days. Here, then, we have natural objects, which the sacred writers always represented in forms of expression current in their times, so interlinked with moral and spiritual truth that it seems almost impossible to separate them—the truth itself seems to depend upon antiquated conceptions of such objects—the institution and sanctification of the Sabbath upon the creation of the world in six literal days. Nor does this difficulty arise from any peculiar views of the relations between revelation and science, but it is one which all alike must face and deal with as best they can, except such as

can still believe that God created all things in six days each of twenty-four hours' length; which, to those who are at all acquainted with the evidence on the subject, is about as easy as it is to believe that the sun revolves around the earth, or that the earth itself rests upon the back of the great Hindoo tortoise.

But passing this difficulty, and leaving every one to deal with it in his own way, if now we undertake to draw from these statements of Moses the moral and spiritual truth which they contain, we shall find that it can hardly be less, and may be more, than that God blessed and sanctified one day in seven on the ground of something in himself which is here characterized as His resting after His work of creation. Whatsoever of truth more than this may be contained in the record we leave to be evolved by others who have a deeper spiritual insight, for in this one we shall find more than we can satisfactorily elucidate.

Here, then, it seems to be clearly revealed that the Sabbath is not an institution of a positive, limited, or temporary character, but that it rests upon or embodies a moral law, that is, a law of universal and immutable obligation. In confirmation of this view we submit the following considerations.

The first of these is that which stands out on the record itself, namely, that the Sabbath was instituted at the creation of the world, and thus established in the life of the first human beings from whom all mankind were to descend. For we cannot rationally conceive of God's blessing and sanctifying a particular day as something which He kept secret at the time—which He did not communicate to those for whom this blessing and sanctification were intended: nor can we understand the words, "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it," otherwise than that He commanded it to be kept holy that it might be a blessing. Accordingly we have abundant evidence that the division of time into weeks of seven days extensively prevailed in

the earliest ages—that it was known, not only among the Hebrews and other Arabic or Semitic nations, but also among the Egyptians, Greeks, Africans, Peruvians, and almost or quite all primitive peoples. The Greeks ascribed its origin, as also that of many other traditional customs for which they could not otherwise account, to the Egyptians. Periods of seven days are mentioned in connection with the Noachian deluge, both in the Bible and in the Assyrian and Babylonian arrowhead inscriptions, which last inform us of several interesting particulars on this subject which do not appear in the Mosaic record, such as that the rain ceased and the ark rested on the summit of the mountain both on seventh days. Also they afford unequivocal evidence that the Sabbath itself was known and reverenced by the ancient Babylonians, and that they regarded it as having been established by God at the creation of the world.* This division of time was certainly known to the patriarchs of Abraham's family, for it is recognized in the account of Jacob's marriage with Leah and Rachel as something well understood, and needing no explanation. In a similar manner, also, it is alluded to in the book of Job, to which an Arabian origin and a date anterior to Moses have been probably assigned. Moreover, that the Sabbath itself was fully recognized as a Divine institution among the Israelites before the decalogue was promulgated is evident from the account which

* On the fifth tablet of the Chaldean account of the creation we find the words:

> On the seventh day He [the Creator] appointed a holy day,
> And to cease from all business He commanded.

Also in the Babylonian calendar the seventh day is designated as the "Sabbath,"—the word literally signifying "a day on which it is unlawful to work:" and, among other prescribed observances, it appears that the king was not allowed to drive in his chariot nor to exercise either his legislative or military functions on that day.

See *Records of the Past*, published under the sanction of the Society of Biblical Archæology (British), Vol. vii. page 164; ix. 118.

is given of the manna. For they were supplied with this "angel's food" whilst they were yet in "the wilderness of Sin," some time before they came to Mount Sinai; and it did not fall on the seventh day, but they were commanded to gather a double portion of it on the sixth, the reason for which Moses gives in these words: "This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath:" and on the morrow he said: "To-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord, to-day ye shall not find it in the field." Notwithstanding, some of them went out to look for it on that day, and were severely rebuked for their unbelief and disobedience: "And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days: abide ye every man in his place; let no man go out of his place on the Sabbath-day." Also, that it was previously known among the children of Israel may be fairly inferred from the words with which the fourth commandment begins: "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." For this expression is in no wise appropriate to the promulgation of a new law, nor to the setting up of an absolutely new institution.

Again, the universal and immutable obligation of the Sabbath is revealed and enforced by the reason here assigned for its sanctification, which is more fully expressed in the command of the decalogue: "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy: six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it." And this reason is still further

unfolded and emphasized in the words: "On the seventh day He rested and was refreshed." Here, indeed, we are brought face to face with a Divine mystery—something in God which is quite incomprehensible to us. But none the less, perhaps all the more, is it a reason for the institution and observance of the Sabbath which can never lose its force, and is of universal application. For it is not anything in man, nor in the times nor countries in which his lot may be cast, nor in any other circumstances, in all which he is mutable, but it is something in God himself, of which 'His resting and being refreshed' is the anthropomorphic yet true expression, and which must remain unchangeably the same for all men, in all times, countries, and other circumstances. Here, then, we have it revealed to our faith that there is something, however mysterious, in the nature or attributes of God upon which the Sabbath is founded, to which it corresponds, and which it manifests to us. Hence, whatever force or validity this reason had for the people of Israel in the time of Moses it must have had from the creation of man upon the earth, and ever since, and must continue to have in all future times for all mankind. Until that shall cease to be true which is signified by God's resting after He had finished His work of creation, the obligation to keep holy the day which He has appointed to commemorate His rest, which is founded on and arises out of it, can never cease—not even in heaven, where, as we are expressly informed in the New Testament, "there remaineth [with whatsoever modifications from different circumstances] a Sabbath-keeping to the people of God."

A third consideration which we cannot pass lightly over is, that the ordinance of the Sabbath is one of the ten great commandments which were spoken by the voice of God himself out of the midst of cloud and flame on the summit of Mount Sinai, and which He wrote with His own finger on tables of stone for a perpetual memorial.

We must now endeavor to elucidate the significance of these facts.

For what reason, then, are we to understand that these commandments were distinguished in such a remarkable manner from all the rest of the Mosaic law? The necessary and obvious answer is, for their superior importance. They were not communicated through the intervention or mediation of any created being, howsoever plenarily inspired, but were spoken by the mouth of God himself in thunder-words to the many thousands of Israel assembled at the foot of the mountain, to signify their paramount importance, as being a transcription from, and an immediate expression of the nature and character of God, in whose image or likeness man had been created, and consequently as being of universal and immutable obligation, in order that by keeping them he might be conformed to the character of his Maker. And still further to symbolize, represent, express and enforce the truth, that their obligation could never cease, that they could never be superseded by any future revelation or higher law, they were written by the finger of God on tablets of stone, the most imperishable and unchangeable of all material which could be employed for this purpose. The other portions of the Mosaic law were not so delivered, but were communicated through the mediation of Moses, and were recorded on perishable materials, such as papyrus, the leaf of a plant, which was the paper then in use, to signify that they were not of equal importance—were not of immutable and universal obligation, but were binding on the people of Israel alone, and on them only for a time—that they were destined to be superseded and done away by a subsequent and more complete revelation. Such is the plain and obvious significance of this distinction between the decalogue and the rest of the law, in the mode of their delivery and in the material on which they were recorded.

This view of the duties enjoined in the decalogue is il-

lustrated and confirmed when we consider them in particular. For in them God prohibits the worship of false gods, idolatry, Sabbath-breaking, profane swearing, false witness-bearing, dishonoring of parents, adultery, murder, theft and covetousness, and enjoins the opposites of these as duties which we owe to Him and to each other. Now all these, unless the Sabbath be an exception, are undeniably matters of universal and immutable obligation, and essential to human welfare alike in all times, places and circumstances. There has never been any dispute upon this point, but they have been universally regarded as embodying the unchangeable principles of morality—principles which do not even depend upon the will of God, except as His will is the expression of His all-perfect moral character and holy nature, which is the ultimate standard of eternal righteousness. With all reverence be it said, God himself cannot make it right for His moral creatures to violate any of these laws, unless that of the Sabbath be an exception, for this would require Him to deny His own nature from which they are transcribed. Can He make it right for any one to dishonor and abuse his own parents? Can He make adultery or murder right? No one in his senses can believe it—and so of all the rest.

Now, since all the other commandments of the decalogue are thus demonstrably of immutable obligation, the question arises, if that of the Sabbath be of a totally different character, for what conceivable reason was it placed among them, spoken with them by the voice of God from the summit of Mount Sinai, and inscribed by His own hand upon tables of stone? If it was to be obligatory upon none but the children of Israel, and on them only for a time, why was it not communicated to them through the mediation of their human legislator along with the other precepts of that law which was destined to be superseded and abolished by a subsequent and more perfect revelation? It may be safely affirmed that no rational answer ever has

been, or ever can be, given to this question; and the inevitable conclusion is, that the law of the Sabbath was regarded by Him who delivered it as of the same character with the rest of the ten commandments, as transcribed from His own immutable nature, as of permanent and universal obligation, and as equally with them essential to the well-being and happiness of mankind. He who thinks otherwise is bound in reason to give a satisfactory answer to the question which has just been asked, as, also, it has been well observed, to do three other things: 1. 'To show where the same authority by which the fourth commandment was enjoined and engraved on the stone tablet has abrogated or revoked it; 2. To show that no other of the ten, or if any other which, or why this one alone, has been annulled and erased; 3. To reform his own and the language of Christendom which has prevailed for two thousand years, so that we shall no more speak of the decalogue, or ten commandments, since, upon this supposition, there are only nine.' Nor is it any objection to this conclusion that the Sabbath is frequently spoken of as a sign between God and His peculiar people by which they were placed under special obligations to serve Him; for, in a precisely similar manner, their deliverance from Egyptian bondage is given as a reason why they should keep all His commandments, but it does not follow from this that other people are under no similar obligation.

We are now prepared to consider our Lord's deliverances on this subject, and to appreciate their true significance. For it has been maintained—and it seems to be a common opinion—that he by his Divine authority greatly relaxed its rigor, if he did not virtually abrogate the law of the Sabbath. But this notion has arisen from the want of close attention to what He actually says on the subject in its connections, and is a possible one only to those who fail to appreciate what has just been stated with respect to the unchangeable morality of the decalogue.

On several occasions, then, our Saviour was accused, mostly by those who belonged to the sect of the Pharisees, of breaking the Sabbath himself, and of allowing his disciples to break it. How does He answer them? Certainly not by denying its immutable obligation, but by convicting his accusers of having misunderstood and perverted it, and of gross inconsistency in their manner of observing it. Thus, when his hungry disciples on the Sabbath had plucked the ears of corn out of the fields to eat, "the Pharisees said unto Him, Behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do on the Sabbath-day." But He justified them by showing that such things as were demanded by human necessity were lawful on that day, and that the Pharisees had perverted it from its original object. He referred them to the example of David, their most eminent saint and greatest national hero, who with his followers had eaten the shew-bread from the tabernacle, and were justified by their necessity, although, apart from such necessity, it was lawful for the priests only to eat that bread. Then he called their attention to the work which had to be done by the priests in the temple-service, which the Pharisees themselves held to be lawful on the Sabbath. Thus he laid open their inconsistency, and themselves to the rebuke: "If ye had known what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless." Also, on the occasion of his healing a man with a withered hand, the Pharisees asked Him: "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath-day? that they might accuse Him. And He said unto them, What man shall there be among you that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath-day, will not lay hold on it and pull it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore, it is lawful to do well [to do good] on the Sabbath-day." On a similar occasion: "Behold, there was a man before Him which had the dropsy, and Jesus answering spake unto the lawyers [interpreters of the law] and

Pharisees, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath-day? And they held their peace. And He took him and healed him and let him go, and answered them, saying, Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a pit, and will not straightway pull him out on the Sabbath-day? And they could not answer him again to these things." In fine, when he was accused of breaking the Sabbath because He had healed "a woman which had a spirit of infirmity," He replied to his accuser: "Thou hypocrite, doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath-day? And when he had said these things, all his adversaries were ashamed." And well they might be! Now, in all this He corrects the erroneous notions which prevailed in His time with respect to the manner in which the Sabbath ought to be sanctified; He shows that works of necessity and mercy and such as pertained to the worship of God were lawful on that day; but He does not even allude to the abrogation nor to any relaxation of its immutable obligation as enjoined in the decalogue.

On the contrary, implicitly at least, He re-affirms it by the declaration made in connection with one of the previous quotations: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." For this declaration was given in rebuke of the Pharisees because they had perverted the Sabbath by teaching the people that works of necessity and mercy were unlawful on that day; which interpretation of the manner in which it was to be observed evidently proceeded on the absurd and immoral principle, that man was made for the Sabbath: whereas the right understanding of all moral law is, that its observance must necessarily be promotive of human well-being, and that no conflict is possible between our duties and our highest interests. And

here it is to be observed, that the Lord does not only say, that 'man was not made for the Sabbath,' but, also, that "the Sabbath was made for man;" that is, not for Jews only, nor for the people of any particular age or country, but for man as such, in all times, places and circumstances. For although it is possible to understand the words otherwise, yet it is undeniable that they naturally bear this sense, and that it is in perfect harmony with all the other Scriptures. This, therefore, is a fair interpretation, and, so understood, this declaration affirms the universal obligation of the Sabbath as essential to the welfare and happiness of mankind. Certainly a greater perversion of the words is not conceivable than to draw from them the sense that the Lord abrogated, or in any wise relaxed the obligation to keep holy the Sabbath-day as enjoined in the fourth commandment.

But, it may be asked, if He did not actually do anything of this kind, did He not claim for himself the power to do it in the words also spoken in connection with a previous quotation: "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath?" It must be acknowledged that at first sight this would appear to be their meaning, but in scrutinizing them more closely, we must bear in mind two things: 1. That the law of the Sabbath is an integral part of the decalogue, which sets forth the eternal principles of morality as founded in the nature of God, and which He himself cannot set aside; 2. That the object which the Lord evidently kept in view in all these arguments with the Pharisees, and the only thing which He undertook to do, was to correct their perversions and abuses of the Sabbath, and to declare on His own authority how it should be sanctified. Now the sense of these words ought not to be pressed beyond this object, and they cannot be without denying the immutable nature of the morality of the decalogue. Neither is it reasonable to suppose that our Lord would assert in such an implicit manner a power to erase and annul one

of the ten commandments and to reduce their number to nine, especially when we remember His solemn declaration: "Verily, I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." It is much more reasonable to understand that in this assertion of his lordship over the Sabbath, He claims no more than an absolute authority to declare and teach how it ought to be sanctified. With this understanding of His words, they may be fairly paraphrased as follows: I, the Son of man, by the same Divine authority which instituted the Sabbath at the creation of the world, and which promulgated the law of its observance from the summit of Mount Sinai, do now and in this way correct your misunderstanding and perversions of it, and show you how you are to keep it holy; for in that sense in which it can be said that God is Lord of the moral law, "the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath."

Having thus seen that our blessed Lord did not abrogate nor at all relax the obligation of the Sabbath, we can hardly anticipate that His apostles would claim authority to do anything of the kind. Hence we are enabled consistently to understand the only remaining passage in the New Testament which presents any difficulty. This occurs in St. Paul's epistle to the Colossians where in our English Bible he is made to say: "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-days, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ." Now it is conceded on all hands that this is a very poor, and, in some respects, an incorrect translation. For in the expression, "sabbath-days," the latter word is not in the original, but has been supplied by the translators: and the words "a holy day," are a palpable mistranslation of a single word in the Greek which properly signifies a feast, and is so rendered in every other place where it occurs, twenty-seven in all. Literally translated, the

passage reads as follows: "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast, or of a new moon, or of sabbaths; which things are a shadow of the things to come, but the body is of Christ." Its general reference, beyond a question, is to the various typical feasts established by Moses, which the Jewish converts were still inclined to observe, whilst the gentiles neglected them, and, with respect to which, every one was left free to do as he pleased; for they were all a shadow of which "the body," or substance, was the gospel "of Christ." And as to the meaning of the word, "sabbaths," we may ask why it is here in the plural, when all the other specifications—meat, drink, a feast, a new moon—are in the singular? The proper answer, no doubt, is, that there were several kinds of sabbaths instituted by Moses, such as that of the seventh month and that of the sabbatical year; and it is to such observances as these that the apostle chiefly refers, classing them where they properly belong with distinctions in meat and drink, new moons, and other ceremonial feasts, all of which were "a shadow of the things to come": and this conclusion is rendered the more probable by the well-known fact, that the Jews were accustomed to call all their festivals sabbaths, because in observing them they rested from secular labor. But in so far as he may have had any reference to the Sabbath of the decalogue, it must have been to the observance of the seventh day along with the first, which was extensively practised by Judaizing Christians. For that here there can be no allusion whatever to the first day of the week, which had now taken the place of the seventh, is conclusively proved by the fact, that it was not called the Sabbath, but "the Lord's Day," by the apostles and primitive Christians. If St. Paul had referred to it, he must have written: Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast, or of a new moon, or of the Lord's Day.

From the preceding considerations, then, we may safely

conclude that there are still ten commandments, instead of nine only, which all alike are of eternal and immutable obligation. But other matters remain to be disposed of, the chief of which is the change just alluded to from the seventh to the first day of the week, which took place at the incoming of the new dispensation. But the difficulty of this has been greatly magnified, and we may expect it almost or quite to disappear with a little close attention to the subject.

Let us observe, then, that our Lord himself, previous to His crucifixion, undoubtedly observed what was then called the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath; and for a long time afterwards more or less sacredness was very naturally attached to that day by His followers. But from the time of His resurrection, the day of the week on which it occurred, and which according to the reckoning then received was the first, began to be observed by His disciples as the day of assemblies for public worship, the celebration of the sacraments, Christian communion, and other sacred purposes. We have abundant evidence of this in the New Testament. Now the fact, that it was so observed could not fail to give it the character and identify it with the Sabbath on which such assemblies had previously been held. But inasmuch as there was no command for the observance of two Sabbaths, that of the seventh day gradually fell into disuse, and in time was entirely superseded. It is true, indeed, that Christians did not call the first day the Sabbath, for that name had become inseparably attached to the seventh; but its observance as such was altogether inevitable from the fact of its being universally recognized as the day for their worshipping assemblies and all other sacred purposes, and because it was impossible for them to believe that the decalogue was, or could be, abrogated. They called it "the Lord's Day." For although this expression occurs but once in the New Testament, where the apostle John

tells us that he "was in the Spirit" on that day, nor does he tell us that he meant by it the first day of the week, yet we know that such was the fact, because this day was universally so called by the Christians of primitive times, as, indeed, it has been ever since. Evidently the apostle introduced the expression as one which would be perfectly understood by all for whom he was writing, and needed no explanation.

The influences which brought about this change may be further elucidated as follows: Our Lord rose from the dead on what was then called the first day of the week, and on that day, or its recurrence, invariably afterwards, He met with and showed himself to His disciples. This took place on at least five different occasions, and we have no evidence that He ever appeared on any other day. This fact naturally led them to expect Him to meet with and manifest himself to them in their worshipping assemblies on that day in preference to all others. In this way, it seems to have become appropriated to such assemblies, and was observed as the Christian Sabbath. Moreover, it was when they were so assembled on the first day of the week that the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit took place, by which they were replenished and endowed with all spiritual gifts and graces for their great work of evangelizing the world. Now the influence of this ever-memorable event in fixing their minds immovably on that day, as the one above all others which was appropriate for their worshipping assemblies, the preaching of the gospel, the celebration of the sacraments, the taking up of charitable collections or offerings, Christian communion, and all the other sacred purposes of the Sabbath, can hardly be overestimated.

Accordingly we find that ever afterwards it was so observed. Thus, when St. Paul, on one of his missionary tours, came to Troas, he "abode seven days; and upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break

bread [for the celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper] Paul preached unto them." With like significance he wrote to the church at Corinth which he had founded: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches in Galatia, so do ye; upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him."

In like manner, we find that in the earliest and subsequent Christian authors whose writings have come down to us, the first day of the week is accepted, and never called in question, as "the Lord's Day," and as devoted to religious purposes, being observed substantially as the seventh day had been under the former dispensation. This was so striking a characteristic of the early Christians that it attracted the attention of heathen writers; for Pliny the younger, proconsul of Bithynia, in the latter part of the first century, alludes to it in his famous report to the emperor Trajan, where he states that the Christians of his province, whom he represents as already immensely numerous, were accustomed to meet for the worship of Christ "on a stated day." Now we know that this "stated day" could not have been the seventh, and consequently that it was, no doubt, the first of the week, or "the Lord's Day." The first Christian author who gives us any information on the subject is Justin Martyr, as he is called, who lived in the close of the first, and the early part of the second century, and who tells us that the Christians did not celebrate the Jewish festivals, nor observe their sabbaths, but that they were accustomed to assemble on the day which the heathen called Sunday, for the reading of the Scriptures, prayer, exhortation and communion. In the epistle ascribed to St. Barnabas, which was generally accepted as genuine at the close of the second century, and which consequently must have been extant in the first, the Lord is introduced addressing the Jews as follows: "The sabbaths which ye now keep are not acceptable unto me, but those

which I have made, when resting from all things I shall begin the eighth day, that is, the beginning of the other world"—a somewhat obscure declaration, but made plain upon the point for which it is here adduced by the following continuation: "For which cause, we [Christians] observe the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus rose from the dead, and, having manifested himself to His disciples, ascended to heaven." Tertullian, also, at the close of the second century, states that "Christians put off even their business on the Lord's Day that they may not give place to the devil," and adds, "We celebrate Sunday as a joyful day." Clement of Alexandria about the same date, says: "A true Christian, according to the commands of the gospel, observes the Lord's Day by casting out all evil thoughts and cherishing all goodness, honoring the resurrection of the Lord which took place on that day." And, in the latter part of the third, or the commencement of the fourth century, Eusebius, the church historian, gives us the following explicit and decisive testimony: "The Word, by the new covenant, translated and transferred the feast of the Sabbath to the morning light, and gave us the symbol of true rest, the saving Lord's Day, the first of light, in which the Saviour obtained the victory over death ... On this day, which is the first of the Light and of the true Sun, we assemble after an interval of six days, and celebrate a holy and spiritual Sabbath: even all nations redeemed by Him throughout the whole world assemble and do those things according to the spiritual law which were decreed for the priests to do on the Sabbath. All things which it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord's Day, as more appropriately belonging to it, because it has the precedence, and is first in rank, and more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath. It has been handed down to us [from the beginning, or from the apostles] that we should ... do these things."

It seems hardly possible that more conclusive evidence

should be given that the primitive church observed the first day of the week as the Sabbath of the new dispensation by doing "all those things which were decreed for the priests to do," and "which it was duty to do, on the Sabbath.... according to the spiritual law." But if such evidence be possible, we find it in the Sabbath laws of the first Christian emperor and his successors. In order to appreciate this, however, we must bear in mind that the conversion of Constantine, who came to the throne of the Roman empire in the commencement of the fourth century, has been much disputed, whether it was sincere, or merely the result of his political sagacity. But however this may have been, one thing is quite certain, that in his time the Christian religion had made such progress throughout the world, that it was an eminently wise political movement on the part of that great monarch to profess and call himself a Christian, and to enact Christian laws. Hence it follows that his Sabbath law, as far as it goes at least, must be taken as the embodiment and expression of the views which generally prevailed among Christians on the subject, and if it had not been, it certainly would have proved but a dead letter. As soon, therefore, as he found himself well settled on the throne, he began to bestow special care on the observance of the Lord's Day. He is known to have required his armies, when not actually engaged, to spend the day in devotional exercises. He prohibited the holding of courts of judicature, and the prosecution of trials and suits at law, and the exercise of all trades and arts in the cities. But the necessary works of agriculture he permitted to go on, and all works of mercy, such as the emancipation of slaves, were held to be lawful. The precise letter of the law is as follows: "Let all judges, inhabitants of cities, and artificers rest on the venerable [or sacred] Sunday. But in the country, husbandmen may freely and lawfully apply to the business of agriculture, since it often happens that the sowing of corn and planting

of vines cannot be so advantageously performed on any other day, lest by neglecting the opportunity they should lose the benefits which the Divine bounty bestows upon us." From this legal permission, however, we cannot infer that all such labors were regarded as lawful by the church, for in this first attempt to embody Christian duties in the laws of the empire, especially when it represented such an immense change from all that had previously existed, such enactments could not be expected to go as far as the views which prevailed among Christians. Accordingly subsequent emperors confirmed and extended this rescript by prohibiting all public shows, theatrical exhibitions, dancing and other amusements; and the councils of the church, as soon as they became free to make their authority felt, decreed the strict observance of the Lord's Day by abstinence from all secular labors, amusements and recreations, and by a faithful attendance upon Divine service.

Now if we try to comprehend all these things in one view, and consider how impossible it is to account for them on any other supposition, they seem to leave no room for doubt but that the holy apostles, either so instructed by the Lord whilst He remained on earth after His resurrection, or inspired by His Holy Spirit, did teach and enjoin that the first day of the week, in place of the seventh, should be the Christian Sabbath, which should be kept holy to God by abstinence from all things prohibited on the Sabbath of the former dispensation, and by devoting it exclusively to spiritual purposes. In fact, the very name of "the Lord's Day," which it is certain they gave it, necessarily implies that it was to be regarded as altogether sacred and devoted to religious observances, for how otherwise could the name have had any propriety or significance?

But here the question arises, how could the apostles, or even the Lord himself, make this change when the original

command was, that the seventh day should be the Sabbath, and since, as we have seen, the Sabbath law is one of eternal and immutable obligation? Now the answer to this question which we regard as perfectly satisfactory, is, that what is meant by "the seventh day" in the commandment is, one day in seven. For this sense of the words is quite as natural and good as any other; and if more than this had been intended, insuperable difficulties would have arisen from the variation to which any more closely specified time is subject with every degree of longitude and latitude, and which is such that days in different places necessarily correspond to different periods of time. That the apostles so understood it is certain from their having made this change, which evidently they could not have done if in their view what was then called the seventh day had been unchangeably appointed and ordained for the Sabbath. Nay, this is almost the necessary interpretation of the command itself, as in the words: "Six days shall thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." For here there is no specification given to Moses or his people as to the particular one on which they should commence to reckon these six days. For aught that appears, they were left free to begin this reckoning any day on which they might agree, or which might be designated by their lawgiver. The command itself certainly includes no more than that the seventh day from that on which their reckoning commenced should be their Sabbath. Neither have we any reason to think that they were informed, or that Moses himself or any one else knew, which was numerically a recurrence of the seventh day from the creation of the world, or how many sevens had since elapsed. Nor do we know what determined in their minds the day on which they actually commenced this reckoning. All that we know is, that they did commence on a certain day, which we for that reason alone call the first day of the week, and that the seventh from it

became their Sabbath. But we do know what controlled the minds of the apostles in making this change—it was the resurrection of the Lord. On the day after that great event occurred they commenced to reckon these six days of labor, and this was the only change they made. For the seventh from that day, according to the commandment, became the Christian Sabbath, precisely as the seventh from another day had been the Jewish Sabbath. Hence it is evident that one is just as much the seventh day as the other, and might with equal propriety have been so called. Probably the reason why it was not was the fact, that the Lord rose from the dead on that day, which, as the beginning of a new spiritual creation, made it eminently fit and proper that it should continue to be the first of the week. But in neither case have we any evidence, either that the Jewish Sabbath was a recurrence of the seventh day from the creation of the world, or that the Christian Sabbath is a recurrence of the day on which the creation commenced.

So slight was the change made by the holy apostles, and so all-controlling were the reasons for it that it seems almost to have taken place of itself, without criticism or comment, and as a matter of course. For no one at the time, so far as we know, objected to it—no one called attention to it. It passed into the life of the church as the light of the sun, in crossing the equator, passes into the life of the new regions which he comes to vivify with his all-quickening beams. And in order that the faith of the Lord's resurrection might thus enter into and new mould the life of the world, it was eminently fitting and proper that it should be commemorated by an institution, the constant observance of which should keep it in everlasting remembrance. For it was the crown and seal which God placed upon His whole redemptive work, which without it would have been utterly in vain—a dead Christ could not have given life to the world. It was

God's seal to convince mankind that He was all He claimed to be—"He was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by His resurrection from the dead." By its Divine efficacy His people are raised up from death in trespasses and sins to the new life of the gospel, for which object it is no less efficacious than is His sacrificial death to expiate their guilt and reconcile them to God: "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection... That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should [be raised up from death in sin and] walk in newness of life." And it is the pledge or earnest which God has graciously given us that we shall be raised up in the resurrection at the last day unto immortality and eternal glory; for "now is Christ risen and become the first fruits of them that slept... If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him." It is in this sense that the resurrection of the Lord is the foundation of all our hopes, and thus we are enabled to say with the holy apostle in his burst of jubilation: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ which, according to His abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead unto an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away."

Hence it was that, as the Jewish Sabbath had been instituted in commemoration of the rest of God after the creation of the world, so the Christian Sabbath was established to commemorate the finished work of Christ in the new creation of the spiritual world. As in the former creation God had said, "Let there be light and there was light," so the resurrection of the Lord was His omnipotent word, saying, Let there be light in the spiritual world, and there was light: "For God who commanded the light to

shine out of darkness hath shined into our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ... Who hath abolished death, and brought light and immortality to light." As at the original creation, order and beauty arose out of the primeval chaos, so at the resurrection of Christ the chaos which had previously reigned in the spiritual world began to give place to the order of moral law and to the beauty of holiness. As God rested from His work of creation when it was finished, so our Lord Jesus Christ, when He had finished His work from which the new creation was to spring, passed into the rest of His eternal glory and reward. And as God, when He looked upon all that He had made, pronounced it very good, so our blessed Lord, surveying the fruits and consequences of His work in the history of mankind, pronounces them all very good; and thus the prophecy is fulfilled: "He shall see of the travail of His soul and shall be satisfied." Indeed, it may be truly said that this new spiritual creation is a greater and nobler work of Divine power than was the creation of the natural world. There were, therefore, the best of reasons why the day on which it was crowned should be forever distinguished from all others as, in a peculiar sense, "the Lord's Day," and why it should be sanctified in place of that which had previously commemorated what now should hardly be remembered by reason of the glory which so much excelled it.

If, now, the preceding argument be sound and conclusive, it follows by inevitable necessity that the instructions given in the Old Testament for the observance of the Sabbath are, in their spiritual import, equally valid for the Sabbath of the new dispensation: and these have been so lucidly and admirably exhibited by the Westminster divines, that we can hardly do better than to present them here in their words, as follows:

"The Sabbath or Lord's Day is to be sanctified by a

holy resting all that day, not only from such works as are at all times sinful, but even from such worldly employments and recreations as are on other days lawful; and [by] making it our delight to spend the whole time (except so much of it as is to be taken up in works of necessity and mercy) in the public and private exercises of God's worship: and to that end, we are to prepare our hearts, and with such foresight, diligence and moderation to dispose and seasonably dispatch our worldly business, that we may be the more free and fit for the duties of the day.... The sins forbidden in the fourth commandment are, all omission of the duties required, all careless, negligent and unprofitable performing of them, and being weary of them, all profaning the day by idleness, and doing that which is in itself sinful, and by needless works, words, and thoughts about our worldly employments and recreations." To this is added, also, among other things: "The charge of keeping the Sabbath is more specially directed to governors of families and other superiors, because they are bound, not only to keep it themselves, but to see that it be observed by all those that are under their charge, and because they are prone ofttimes to hinder them by employments of their own."

Now, all these obligations are founded on clear statements in the word of God, some of which are exceedingly instructive as illustrating the nature and extent of that observance of the Sabbath which He requires. One of these is contained in the account which is given us of the manna in the wilderness. For since a universal and pressing temptation to violate this Divine law would necessarily arise in connection with the provision and preparation of man's daily food, special pains had to be taken to guard this point. Accordingly, even before the law had been re-affirmed from Mount Sinai, an example of its violation occurred, which is carefully recorded, and which, no doubt, was permitted, for the instruction of all succeed-

ing generations of mankind. For the manna, as we have seen, did not fall on the seventh day, and the people were strictly prohibited from going out to look for it on that day: a double portion fell on the sixth day, and they were commanded to gather twice as much on that day, and to prepare what was left over to serve them on the Sabbath. Thus it was said to them: "The Lord hath given you the Sabbath; therefore, he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place—let no man go out of his place on the Sabbath-day. . . . To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe, and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning." And on the morrow it was said to them: "Eat that to-day, for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord; to-day ye shall not find it in the field. . . . And it came to pass that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none." Also, if they gathered more than was necessary on any other day, it corrupted and bred worms; but that which they prepared on the sixth day for the Sabbath did not corrupt, "neither was there any worm therein." Now, if there be in all this any instruction for us, it cannot surely be less than that we are prohibited from all unnecessary provision and preparation of food on the Sabbath-day. Here it is enjoined that our food for that day is to be cooked on the day preceding. We are taught, moreover, that by such abstinence we shall lose nothing; that God's blessing on our industry will enable us by six days' labor to provide for the seventh; and that all unnecessary labor on that day will prove unprofitable. Indeed, if men would take pains to make suitable observations on this point, we have reason to believe that nothing could be found more uniform and remarkable than the utter unprofitableness of Sunday work.

Similar instructions also are given us by the prophet

Nehemiah after the return from the captivity in Babylon, where the people seem to have fallen into great laxity in the observance of the Sabbath. Some of these are as follows: "In those days I saw in Judah some treading wine-presses on the Sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses, as, also, wine, grapes and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the Sabbath-day: and I testified against them in the day wherein they sold victuals. There dwelt men of Tyre also therein, which brought fish and all manner of ware, and sold on the Sabbath unto the children of Judah in Jerusalem. Then I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do, and profane the Sabbath-day? Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us and upon this city? Yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath." The interest of this passage, however, lies not so much in its prohibition of secular employments connected with 'the selling and buying of victuals,' but more especially in the fact, that it brings distinctly into view the duties of governors and rulers, as such, to protect all men in the observance of the Sabbath by such exercise of their authority and such laws as shall in no wise favor, but discourage and suppress its open and public violation. For inasmuch as it involves one of the great moral principles of the decalogue, laws for the protection and promotion of its observance, with penalties for its violation, rest on the same foundation, are of the same character, and are no less necessary to the well-being of mankind, than legal prohibitions of theft, adultery and murder. To enact and execute such laws is a duty which nations and rulers owe to God on their own responsibility; and it has no more connection with questions of union between church and state than any other enactments founded on Christian morality (in distinction from pagan and Mohammedan) which is the common law of all Christian countries.

Moreover, the Sabbath is not only to be observed by abstinence from all such unnecessary labors, but is to be kept holy with the mind and heart. This is necessarily implied in its New Testament name of "the Lord's Day," as also in the words, "the holy Sabbath unto the Lord," "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" and it is clearly brought out in many passages, such as the following: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord honorable; and shalt honor Him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." And the opposite violations of the Sabbath with the mind and heart are thus stigmatized: "Hear ye this, O ye that swallow up the needy, even to make the poor of the land to fail, saying, When will the new moon be gone that we may sell corn, and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small and the shekel great, and falsying the balances of deceit?" Now here we are prohibited from doing our own works, from speaking our own words, from thinking our own thoughts, and from seeking in any way our own pleasure, that is, from all actions, thoughts and affections concerning our secular employments and recreations, and from that impatience and weariness which are inseparable from the restraints of Sabbath-keeping where the heart is not in it; and all such things are properly associated where they belong, with dishonesty and oppression of the poor, to which they often lead. These prohibitions enjoin, of course, the opposite duties, which also are mostly expressed, namely, that we think the thoughts of God, seek the pleasure of God, speak the words of God, and do the works of God; that we count this holy day of the Lord honorable and a

delight—that we take delight in its holy exercises and devotions; and to such observance of it all temporal and spiritual blessings are promised on the faith of God: "For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

In conclusion, the motives which we have for the faithful observance of the Sabbath are, when rightly appreciated, of all-controlling efficacy. In general, they are all that have force and weight to incline our hearts to keep any other of God's commandments. In particular, they are such as the following:

1. We have our Lord's declaration that "the Sabbath was made for man," the force of which is, that its proper observance is necessary to the well-being and happiness of mankind—that there is a blessing from God in it—and this is abundantly confirmed by all experience. For if such experience can make anything certain, it is that rest from labor and worldly cares one day in seven is indispensable to health of body and mind. Uninterrupted secular employments exhaust the life, induce softening of the brain, paralytic affections, epilepsies, consumptions, and many other acute and fatal maladies. The employment of the Sabbath in the worship and service of God, and in unselfish endeavors to do good to others, brings with it a change in the currents of thought and other mental exercises and in the bodily activities which is refreshing, reinvigorating and healthful—it inspires new life and energy after the secular toil of the week. This change is most necessary for laboring people, who receive as much compensation for six days' work as they would for seven, and who accomplish thereby as much, no doubt, for their employers. The plea that such people need to spend the day in worldly recreation and pleasure-seeking, and are justified in so doing, has nothing in it but deceitful plausibility; for where it is thus perverted into a mere secular holiday, it soon becomes, through the exactions of employers and the pressure of want on the unemployed, a day of

labor like the others. Of all people, the poor have the greatest need to stand by the religious observance of the Sabbath; for it is their strongest protection against that oppression of their taskmasters which is so closely connected, as we have seen, with the violation and relaxed observance of God's holy day.

2. The Sabbath is indispensable to the proper influence and success of the Christian religion in the world. For it affords the only suitable and practicable time and opportunity for the people to assemble themselves together for public worship, the preaching of the gospel, the celebration of the sacraments, Christian communion, and Sabbath-school teaching: and without these, with the exception of the last, which is not therefore to be regarded as of small importance, there can be no Christianity. If they should fall into desuetude, not only could it make no progress, but it would soon die out of the world. Its power in different countries may even now be measured by the manner in which the Sabbath is observed. For where it has ceased to be regarded as a holy day, and has become for the most part a secular holiday, there we find a very sparse attendance on church services in the morning, and the afternoon and evening are given up to pleasure seeking; in consequence of which, drunkenness, immorality and crime abound, and there is more of these than on any other day. It is well understood that to close up on the Sabbath the places where intoxicating liquors are sold would ruin most of them. On the other hand, where the day is the most strictly and generally observed, there religion has the greatest power for the salvation of man—there we uniformly find the least immorality, drunkenness, pauperism and crime. We make no show of evidence here because these things are undeniable: whence it is evident that the enemies of the Sabbath are the enemies of the Christian religion.

3. Sabbath-breaking brings upon men some of the

heaviest judgments of God. There is hardly anything more insisted on in the Word than this; and it is equally true of individuals, communities and nations. Thus the captivity in Babylon is represented in many places as a judgment upon Israel for this sin, of which the following is a single example: "And them that had escaped from the sword carried he away to Babylon, where they were servants . . . to fulfil the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had enjoyed her Sabbaths; for as long as she lay desolate she kept Sabbath to fufil three score and ten years." Also, in many other places, the banishment of the Jews from Palestine, the desolation of their cities and country, and their dispersion throughout the world, as we see them now, are ascribed to their sin of Sabbath-breaking, of all which the following is a single example: "And I will scatter you among the heathen, and will draw out a sword after you, and your land shall be desolate and your cities waste. Then shall the land enjoy her Sabbaths as long as it lieth desolate, and ye be in your enemies' land: even then shall the land rest and enjoy her Sabbaths." In fact, a great many of God's judgments upon men are in His word connected directly or indirectly with the violation of the fourth commandment; and this, for the best of reasons, as we can see, namely, that this sin is often the beginning and root of many others; whilst strict morality in this particular is a mighty defence against temptation in all circumstances.

4. But the only effectual motive to Sabbath-keeping, we are persuaded, must be drawn from the reason which God himself has given us, in that "He rested and was refreshed" after His work of creation; in other words, that there is something in God which the Sabbath represents, and to which it corresponds. Where this motive is not enforced, we may expect "the holy of the Lord" to be, as now it is, imperfectly sanctified by the best, and generally violated without remorse or compunction. Its restoration

to its true place in the church, we have reason to anticipate, could hardly fail to be accompanied and followed by a mighty increase of her spiritual light, and of her spiritual power for the salvation of mankind.

XIV

THE INSTITUTION AND ORGANIZATION OF SOCIETY

And the Lord God said, It is not good that man should be alone: I will make him a help meet for [counterpart to] him.... Male and female created He them, and blessed them: and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

In these sublime deliverances, we have the origin and institution, the nature and objects, of human society, as it lay before the mind of God when He created man. The words, "It is not good that man should be alone," express the most comprehensive of all his necessities, namely, that of association with his kind. To satisfy this want, a woman was created, and marriage instituted, for the procreation of human beings; and thus society was instituted. Also, in the words, literally translated, "I will make him a help counterpart to him," we have given the most fundamental principle of the marriage union, and of all human associations. For it is this counterpartness of man and woman to each other—physical, intellectual and moral—which renders marriage organic in its nature, and constitutes it the foundation and type of organic society. In fine, the object of this arrangement as here stated, is, that man, by his associated energies, should subdue and control the forces of nature and the properties of matter to his own uses and ends. Thus we have laid open before us the whole vast realm of social science, and the principles authoritatively prescribed by which only is it possible to

comprehend in unity the infinite variety and complexity of the social phenomena. These principles we now undertake to elucidate.

But, first, it may be premised, that there is not a little prejudice in the minds of sensible and well-informed people against sociology, that is, the science of human society. This is due, no doubt, to a variety of causes, one of which is, that this whole department of knowledge has commonly been identified with political economy, which, in fact, includes only one or two of at least six co-ordinate branches of the general subject: and the influence of this cause has been all the greater inasmuch as the methods and conclusions of the different authors in economics have hitherto proved anything but harmonious or satisfactory. Besides this, the social forces and phenomena are so numerous, and so complicated with each other, that a complete analysis of them seems to be an almost hopeless task. But probably the most influential of these causes is, that the subject has had a peculiar attraction for, and has been most copiously treated by infidel authors, such as Hobbes, Comte, Buckle, J. Stewart Mill and Herbert Spencer. This, however, ought not to influence our minds when we consider what ample instruction God has given us on the subject of our social relations, which certainly implies that the science of them, notwithstanding their number and complexity, is a possible one. Moreover, this science treats, as we shall presently see, of a vast number of most interesting problems, the solution of which can hardly fail to affect the welfare of mankind as deeply and permanently as any that have been agitated since the rise of the Protestant reformation. But, apart from these considerations, there are two all-sufficient reasons for a critical examination of the nature of human society. One of these is, that man is essentially rational, and hence under a necessity of striving to render to himself a rational account of the phenomena of his own life, in which the social

element everywhere predominates. Thus he is naturally led to undertake a description and classification of the social facts, in order to determine, in the interest of science, the laws by which they are governed. The other reason is, that such a rational comprehension of the social instincts tends to bring them under the control of reason and free-will, apart from which, they are like untrained and unpruned vines, which run wild, waste their redundant energies, and frustrate their own ends. For whatsoever is distinctively human is such from its connection with reason and free-will; everything else in man is either animal or vegetable.

The social instincts, which have just been mentioned, are the primary cause of all association among living creatures. In the animal or lower, as well as in all the higher and spiritual elements of his complex nature, man is a social being. As by nature birds fly in the air, and fish swim in the water, so man, by that which he has in common with the animals, lives in society. As mere animals, human beings would associate together for the same reasons that bees live in swarms, and beavers in tribes.

The nobler elements of human nature are equally social. As rational beings, we have an inborn consciousness, an intuitive perception, of our vital dependence upon society. The moral and spiritual nature in man is pre-eminently social, and incapable of being otherwise comprehended, developed and perfected. For man is not man but in and through association with his kind. Human life is essentially a communion. The perfect idea of humanity can never be realized apart from that great principle which is enunciated in the words of the Apostles' Creed: "I believe in the communion of saints." Such is the profound significance of the declaration: "It is not good for man to be alone." Accordingly, in all ages and countries, both in that undeveloped or degraded condition in which the animal predominates over the rational and moral nature,

and in the highest state of civilization and enlightenment, in which the spiritual gives the supreme law to human life, men have lived, and must ever live, in society. Solitude is naturally hateful, and an adequate punishment for the worst crimes. Hence the peculiar form in which the death, penalty was prescribed in the law of Moses: "That soul shall be cut off from his people.

This all-pervading principle of association is limited, however, by the distinction between species in living creatures; in other words, it is conditioned by specific unity of life. For animals of diverse species, except under artificial arrangements, do not flock or herd or swarm together. Even the most closely allied forms of animal life, such as the bison and the cow, the dog and the wolf, are naturally the bitterest enemies to each other. They seem to be incapable of understanding and of sympathizing with each other, and, hence, of associating together. The case is similar with man, who can hardly form any conception of the consciousness or experience of a mere animal, or of an angel, or, indeed, of any creature belonging to a different species from his own. If there were not this unity of life in mankind, if we were not all properly of one species, there could be no mutual understanding or sympathy among us, and we could not associate with each other any more than the fox with the dog, or the bee with the beaver.

Yet there is a fundamental difference between man and the lower creatures with respect to their associations. For that of animals, except in their distinctions of sex, is mostly destitute of that counterpartness upon which organization is founded, and which is the most essential characteristic of human society. Among animals of the same species, which only can associate together in a state of nature, there is little or no diversity of faculty and function, of special characteristics and adaptations, corresponding to each other in different individuals. The members of a *grex*, whether a

tribe, or flock, or swarm, are all substantially alike, and little more than mere repetitions of each other. This uniformity is so striking that it is marked in the most widely separated languages of mankind by the use of the singular for the plural, as where we say, a flock of sheep, not sheeps, a herd of deer, a tribe of beaver, a school of fish, not deers, nor beavers, nor fishes.

It is true, however, that we find in some species of insects what seems to be a pre-intimation of this diversity of faculty and function, and a semblance of organization founded upon it. In a bee-hive, *e. g.*, there are several distinct classes of individuals included within the common species, each of which is charged with a different set of operations. Here we have the mother or queen bee, the males or drones, the nurses, the workers in wax, and the workers in honey. But, even in this case, the individuals of each class are mere numerical repetitions of each other, and are confined to the same operations by a distinct and peculiar physical constitution. We discover nothing here of the nature of voluntary division or organization of labor. One bee does not gather wax and pass it to another to be built into a cell, neither does one gather honey and pass it to another to be stored. Even here, therefore, the grex offers us nothing beyond that semblance of organization in which, as in so many other instances, the operations of animal instinct counterfeit those of human reason. Among animals, in general, there is not even this semblance. Those of the same species are all confined to means and operations which are precisely or nearly the same. Birds of the same species all build their nests in the same manner, and there is no part in the work of a beaver-dam, so far as we know, which one beaver cannot perform as well as another. Mere animals are incapable of specializing their employments, incapable of voluntary division and organization of their labors, and hence their association with each other is properly inorganic.

But, whilst the grex is thus incapable of organized association, the individuals of which it is composed are abundantly capable of co-operating together for common ends, and thus of increasing their force by massing their numbers. And, in this way, the principle of animal association enters also into human society, most largely, as we should anticipate, where man is least developed, or most degraded, and his condition approaches most nearly to that of the brute. For it is in such communities that we find the fewest and least marked divergencies from the common type, the least diversity of special characteristics and adaptations, and hardly any specialization or diversification of employments. Each wild man builds his own hut, or finds for himself a natural cave to shelter him from the elements, makes his own weapons, does his own hunting and fishing, and gathers for himself the spontaneous fruits of nature. Here, also, marriage and the family, the foundation and chief corner-stone of organized society, are almost or quite unknown. Consequently, whilst all are thus engaged in the same pursuits and operations, their human capacity for personal differentiation remains undeveloped. They are almost as much alike as the wild horses of the South American savannahs. We find it so to this day in Africa, Australia, among the ante-Brahmanical tribes of India, and elsewhere. The striking resemblance of the American Indians to each other in color, stature, features, mental and moral characteristics, and in other numerous particulars, has been often remarked, and various explanations of it have been suggested; but the true reason, beyond a question, is, that their wild life affords them the least possible diversification of employments. Hence they have few other ways of increasing their force than that of massing their numbers. In these low forms, human life, in its association as in other respects, approaches that of mere animals.

This principle of animal gregariousness, in default of a better word, enters, also, as a substratum, into the higher

and more developed forms of human society. We see it in a gang of field-hands picking cotton, in a gang of "loggers" felling timber, in a gang of laborers digging a canal, and wherever the word gang is applied to a company of human beings. These, indeed, are not perfect examples, for some degree of specialization enters into almost all human employments. And this simple co-operation of numbers, with little diversity in the means used, is of such importance to the great objects of human society that, without it, little could ever have been accomplished. For the units of personal force are so small and feeble that, apart from mutual aid, they could hardly fail to be swallowed up, in no long time, by the hostile forces of nature—those vast and fatal forces, which threaten us from every quarter, and which destroy without mercy all the feebler forms of human, animal and vegetable life; but which man, by his associated and organized energies, subjugates to his own uses and ends, until, with all the docility of domesticated animals, they grind in his mills, carry his messages with lightning speed, and transport him and his merchandise, as the bird flies, from continent to continent and from pole to pole.

These grand results are mainly due to organization founded on counterpart differences between individuals, which is the leading characteristic of human society, as distinguished from animal gregariousness, and the most fundamental principle of social science. It is our lamp and clue in the exploration of the labyrinths of this vast department of knowledge. By it alone are we enabled to comprehend the phenomena with which we have to deal. It is to the infinite number and complexity of the social phenomena what the principle of gravitation is to the physical universe. Without it, society is a chaos; with it, a cosmos. Hence we can make no further progress in this discussion until we have formed a distinct and precise conception of this all-comprehending principle.

Let us observe, then, that an organism in nature is a body possessed of life and various organs, which organs minister to the support, development and manifestation of its life. For this purpose they are in vital union with the body, and, also, with each other, in consequence of which they are mutually interdependent, and contribute to each other's support and well-being by a system of vital exchanges among themselves. Thus the human body is an organism. It is possessed of life, and is composed of organs, such as the hands, feet, stomach, heart, lungs, brain, eyes, nose and mouth. These organs are in vital union with the body, and thereby, with each other. Also, they are different from each other, and perform different functions in their ministry to the body and to each other; and they are mutually interdependent by a system of vital exchanges among themselves. The hands, *e. g.*, provide food for the mouth, the mouth prepares it and delivers it over to the stomach, and the stomach distributes it as nourishment back again to the hands, mouth, and all the other organs and parts of the body. Such is an organism in nature—the grand type of organic society.

It is no less necessary for us to form a distinct and clear conception of the principal differences between the higher and lower organisms in nature, for the reason that these represent the more and less advanced stages of organization in society. The higher, then, an organism is, the more numerous and perfect are its organs, the more diverse they are from each other, the more specialized are their functions, the more interdependent they are, and the more full and complete is the system of exchanges among them. The highest organism in nature is that of the human body, and we see how numerous and perfect are its organs; how different they are from each other—as the eye from the hand, the stomach from the brain; how diverse and specialized are their functions, so that by no means can the heart perform the work of the lungs, nor the feet that

of the brain; how dependent they are upon each other, so that a lesion of one will often paralyze them all; and how full and perfect is the system of vital exchanges among them, in that the brain directs the hands, the hands provide food for the stomach, and the stomach nourishes the brain. On the other hand, the lower an organism is, the fewer and less perfect are its organs, the more they resemble each other, the less special are their functions, the more independent they are of each other, and the feebler are the exchanges among them. The angle-worm is an example, and how few are its organs—there are but three or four of them—and these are so much alike, perform so nearly the same functions, and are so independent of each other, that, if it be cut in two, each part, it is said, will continue to live, and will become a perfect worm. But, whether this be true of the earth-worm or not, it is certainly true of the polype, a still lower organism. There are, of course, many other differences between the higher and the lower forms of organization, but these are the principal ones, and are sufficient for our present purpose.

In further illustration of these organic differences, we quote from the *Morphologie* of Goethe as follows:

"The more imperfect a creature is, the more do its parts resemble each other, and the whole to which they belong. The more perfect a creature is, the more dissimilar are its parts. In the former case, the parts are more or less a repetition of the whole; in the latter, they are unlike the whole. The greater the resemblance between the parts, the less subordination there is of one to another. Subordination indicates a high grade of organization." *

Professor Arnold Guyot, also, in his *Earth and Man*, applies these laws of organization to illustrate the nature of human society as follows:

"Differences are the condition of development. The

* Goethe's *Sammtliche Werke*, Sechsanddreissigster Band, p. 7.

mutual exchanges which are the consequences of these differences waken and manifest life. The greater the diversity of organs, the more active and superior is the life of the individual; and the greater the variety of individualities and of relations in a society, the greater also is the sum of life, the more complete, and of the more elevated order." *

Now, in all these particulars and in many others which might be enumerated, organisms in nature symbolize and represent human society, especially its higher and lower forms, its more and less advanced stages of organization. And this analogy is so complete and obvious that it has always been recognized, and has become so familiar that "the social organism" seems hardly to involve a figure of speech. Thus Plato, in his model *Republic*, divides the citizens into three classes corresponding to the three principal faculties of the human mind. The first of these is that of the rulers which represent the intellect or reason of society; the second is the military class, typified by the human will; the third includes all who are engaged in the pursuits of industry, and who, in his scheme, correspond to the passions and appetites of the animal nature in man. Here, however, the analogy is very imperfectly comprehended, and is perverted to inculcate gross heathen errors, especially that of the essential degradation of the industrial class. Aristotle also teaches us that:—

"A state [or body politic] is composed of dissimilar parts, as an animal is of life and body . . . of these and many other dissimilar parts."

But, unlike Plato, he makes little or no use of the analogy, although he indorses and emphasizes the errors which had been drawn from it by his great predecessor. For in another place he makes the following authoritative deliverance:

"It is impossible for a mechanic, or hired servant, to

* *Earth and Man*, pp. 100, 101.

practice a life of virtue... It is not proper for any man of honor, nor for any citizen, nor for any one engaged in public affairs, to learn these servile employments."

In modern times, also, this analogy has been recognized and its significance expounded, as in the celebrated work of Hobbes on *Civil and Ecclesiastical Society* entitled *Leviathan*, which name he applies to society itself, as follows:

"That great Leviathan called a commonwealth or state (civitas)... is but an artificial man, though of greater strength and stature than the natural... in which the sovereignty is an artificial soul... reward and punishment, the nerves; wealth and riches... its strength; *salus populi* ... its business... concord, health; sedition, sickness; civil war, death."

It is true that in all this, as in everything else by the same author, there is a great deal that is very "artificial," but the conception of society as an organism, which runs through the whole work, is none the less true and profound. Again, in the *Sociology* of Comte, this conception is developed and applied in great fulness of detail, and it is the fundamental idea of the *Principles of Social Science*, by Henry C. Carey, and of all his voluminous writings on this subject. In fine, Herbert Spencer lays down the three following points of resemblance between organisms in nature and human societies, although he fails to make any adequate use of them for the solution of social problems:

"The first is, that, commencing as small aggregations, they—that is, both organisms in nature and societies—insensibly augment in mass, some of them reaching eventually perhaps a hundred thousand times what they originally were. The second is, that, while at first so simple in structure as to be almost considered structureless, they assume, in the course of their growth, a continually increasing complexity of structure. The third is, that, though in their early undeveloped state there exists in them

scarcely any mutual dependence of parts, these parts gradually acquire a mutual dependence, which becomes at last so great that the activity and life of each part is made possible only by the activity and life of the rest. These parallelisms will appear the more significant, the more we contemplate them. . . The orderly progress from simplicity to complexity displayed by societies in common with every living body whatever . . distinguishes them from inanimate bodies . . and this functional dependence of the parts . . is exhibited by the noblest animals and the highest societies in the greatest degree. . . The lowest types of animals do not increase to anything like the size of the higher ones; and similarly we see that aboriginal societies are comparatively of limited growth. In complexity, also, our civilized nations as much exceed the primitive savage ones as a vertebrate animal does a zoöphite. In simple communities, moreover, as in simple creatures, the mutual dependence of the parts is so slight that subdivision or mutilation causes little inconvenience, whilst in complex communities, as in complex creatures, you cannot remove or injure any considerable organ without producing great disturbance or death to the rest."

We conclude these citations with one from St. Paul, in which he sets forth the Divine idea of society, as destined to be first realized in the Christian church, and ultimately in all mankind, and which contains, beyond comparison, the most full and significant exhibition of the organic structure of society that has ever been given in such few words. It all turns upon the analogy between the human organism and man's association with his kind, to which he elsewhere refers in many different connections; but here he devotes a long chapter to a detailed exposition of it, emphasizing the diversity of organs, functions, ministries and operations within the organic unity of the social body, in order to show that the individuals of which it is composed bear to it and to each other relations similar to those

between the human body and its members, and between the members themselves. The passage is in part as follows:—

"As the body is one and hath many members, and as all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ [Christian society]. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body, is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body, is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? . . And if they were all one member, where were the body? But, now, they are many members, yet one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor, again, the hand to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much more those members of the body which seem to be more feeble are necessary; and those members of the body which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more abundant honor, and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness; for our comely parts have no need. But God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honor to that part which lacked, that there should be no schism in the body, but that the members should all have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular."

If, now, we compare this splendid exhibition of the organic structure of society, and of the relations and duties of the different members of the organism, especially in respect to the honor here bestowed upon "the more feeble," with the imperfect grasp of the idea by Plato and Aristotle, as in their condemnation of the laboring classes to hopeless degradation, we shall obtain a glimpse of the immeas-

urable intellectual as well as moral superiority of Christianity to heathenism, even when this latter is thus represented by the greatest minds it ever produced. Here we see what a world-wide difference there is between the views which are given us in the Holy Scriptures with respect to those members of society "which we think to be less honorable," and those which were inculcated by heathen philosophy: and, assuredly, there would be fewer infidels among the laboring masses, if they only knew how much they are indebted to the Christian religion.

Here, then, we may take occasion to lay down a fundamental principle of method in social science, as we may hope that one day it will come to be exhibited. This consists in the application of the moral laws of Christianity to the solution of all the social, but, especially, of the industrial problems. For however sceptical men may be with respect to the supernatural origin of our holy religion, they hardly ever fail to recognize the excellence of its moral laws; and the scientific value of these laws, as distinguished from their religious obligation, is illustrated in this science in an entirely new and striking manner. Hence we may confidently anticipate that this line of investigation will develop in time the crowning argument in the evidences of Christianity. For in an experience of many years' teaching, we have found it the most effectual antidote to that distressing scepticism which is now so rife, even in the minds of ingenuous and thoughtful young men. But however this may be, in the application of these laws to the solution of the industrial and all the other social problems—problems which agitate and divide the most advanced thinkers of our time—we can feel that we touch bottom; that we have struck the solid rock; and, building on this foundation, we can foresee that we shall be able in time to establish a science of society which time itself will never be able to overthrow.

We proceed now to exhibit the organic structure of so-

ciety by means of the relations which its organs bear to their organism and to each other. Of these organs there are two classes, which we may characterize as *vital* and *teleological*. The vital organs, in a sense analogous only to that which these words have in physiology, are the individuals or living persons of which society is composed. The teleological organs are the institutions which embody and represent the general aims, objects, ends, for which society exists.

First, then, we consider the organic structure of society as depending upon its vital organs. And here we are immediately struck with the wonderful fact, that, among the innumerable individuals of the human race, no two can be found who are in all respects like each other. All human beings are either different from each other by nature, or they have by nature a capacity for facile differentiation. Each person has some peculiar characteristic, or quality, or capacity, or faculty, or combination of faculties, or degree of their development, in virtue of which he is adapted to do something which cannot be so well done, or to fill some place which cannot be so well filled, by any other person. One is endowed with great physical strength, another with superior intellectual ability; one has a natural or acquired adaptation for recluse study, another for business and affairs; one is born a poet, another becomes an orator. In so far as society depends upon the rational and moral nature in man, rather than upon animal instinct; in the degree in which it shapes itself and directs its energies to rational and moral aims, that is to say, just so far as it becomes distinctively human, do these individual differences develop and manifest themselves.

For the differences which exist by nature lead to diversity of occupations. It is natural for men and women to employ themselves differently. Men who are possessed of great physical endowments naturally apply themselves to those pursuits in which success depends upon such qualifi-

cations. Those of superior intellectual powers, but, perhaps, of feeble health and strength, are naturally guided in their selection of employments by these special adaptations. The natural tendency in these matters is for every one to addict himself to that mode of life in which he feels himself most capable of achieving success. Differences of taste, also, and of outward circumstances, have much to do with this diversity of occupation. From some of these causes it was, no doubt, that "Abel became a keeper of sheep, and Cain a tiller of the ground;" that "Jabal was the father of such as dwell in tents and have cattle;" that "Jubal was the father of all such as handle the harp and organ . . . and Tubal-Cain was an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron."

Again, this diversification of employments reacts upon the natural differences from which it springs, and gives them a more copious development. For as each person occupies himself with some specialty, he becomes more specialized. In this way, the sailor and the farmer are differenced from each other by their peculiar modes of life in their physical forms, in the muscles which are most fully developed, in their gait, features, language, mental faculties and habits, and even in their moral characters, to such a degree that it is almost impossible to mistake one for the other. A similar differentiation takes place from the almost infinite diversification of employments throughout the whole circle of every highly organized community, which is composed of farmers, millers, bakers, graziers, butchers, cooks, carpenters, masons, blacksmiths, white-smiths, spinners, weavers, tailors, shoemakers, hatters, merchants, bankers, shippers, sailors, engineers, brakemen, stokers, telegraph operators, lawyers, doctors, teachers, artists and clergymen—of these and numberless others engaged in special employments and pursuits in their endless subdivisions and branches. There is not one of these which does not exert a great influence to differentiate the members of society from each other.

Moreover, these personal differences, both natural and acquired, and these different employments, are, in a wonderful manner, the counterparts and complements of each other, as, in the human organism, are the stomach, mouth, heart, lungs and senses. These counterpart and complementary relations are the most pronounced and conspicuous between the two sexes; but they are similar, only in a lower degree, between the farmer and the miller, the miller and the baker, the baker and his customers; between the iron-miner, the iron-manufacturer, the hardware-merchant and his customers; between the merchant, the shipper and the railroad men, and so on throughout the whole vast circle of organized society. Thus, both the individuals and their employments are mutually adapted to, and fit into each other, like the carpenter's tenons and mortices, the fans of dovetailing, the balls and sockets of the animal joints, and the sutures of the human skull. Hence we have one of the main sources of that intense attraction which binds society together, and which steadily increases as organization advances. For it is in virtue of these counterpart differences that the individual members of the social body are mutually interdependent, for supplying each other's wants, by that all-comprehending system of exchanges which is inseparable from organization.

Societary attraction from this source has often been illustrated by that association which naturally takes place between two beggars, one of whom is blind and the other lame, in which the blind man carries the lame on his shoulders, and the lame guides the steps of the blind, so that the eyes of one and the legs of the other serve for both. Also, it has been illustrated by a beautiful analogue in chemistry, as if even here nature were striving upwards towards organization. For it is found that no two ultimate particles of matter which are precisely alike, that is, no two atoms of oxygen or of hydrogen, manifest any attraction for each other, but are mutually repellant. As

soon, however, as we bring together unlike particles, atoms of oxygen and of hydrogen, under the proper conditions, they immediately rush into each other's embrace and form a chemical combination. Moreover, as even unlike particles will not combine in other than definite proportions, so many and no more of oxygen with so many and no more of hydrogen, so must there be a definite proportion or correspondence between these differences both in human beings and in their employments, in order that their mutual attraction should be developed, and the organization of society attain to its utmost fulness and completeness. So many tailors and no more can combine with so many shoemakers in any particular community. Where either of these trades is in excess, a portion of its members will be out of work, and ready to leave their place in search of employment elsewhere: and so it is in all the other specialties. But the more perfectly these differences correspond to each other in numbers and adaptations, the more completely does each individual find the supply of his deficiencies in the endowments and productions of the others, the stronger becomes the societary attraction, the more firmly is society dovetailed or sutured together, the higher its organization rises, and the nobler is the life which it develops and manifests.

But the most beautiful example of all this we have in the marriage union, which is itself the most perfect of all the social organisms, as it is that from which society originates and derives its organic nature. For marriage is wholly founded upon these counterpart and complementary differences in their most pronounced forms. The two sexes differ from each other in a greater number of particulars, and these differences are more perfectly the counterparts and complements of each other, than in the case of any two individuals of the same sex. With respect to their physical forms and functions this is sufficiently obvious; we need only to observe that here, as elsewhere, the outward

and material is the type of the inward and spiritual. For in man, the intellect predominates, in woman, the affections; and of the intellect itself, the reasoning or logical faculties are the more active and influential in man, the intuitive in woman. In man, strength and courage are distinguishing traits, in woman, patience and fortitude. Prudence is the stronger in man, whose governing motives arise from consideration of the fruit of actions, and from forecast of ends or objects to be attained; faith and spiritual instincts and susceptibilities are the stronger in woman, whose most influential motives arise from the inward promptings of her heart.

Now, it is from these counterpart and complementary differences that the two sexes, in the marriage union, are mutually dependent, that which is lacking in each being supplied from the fulness and overflow of the other. Hence arises that beautiful system of vital exchanges, that veritable communion of life, from which all subsequent life originates, and in which, on both sides, "it is more blessed to give than to receive." For the woman is supported and defended by the superior strength and courage of her husband; the man is sustained and comforted by the sympathy, patience and fortitude of his wife. He imparts to her of his prudence and forethought; she to him of her faith and spiritual insight. Her reasoning faculties are strengthened and become clearer and steadier by communion with his understanding; his intellect is informed and quickened by communion with her more direct and living intuitions, and his heart is warmed by the flame of her affections. These vital exchanges, moreover, are accompanied by others arising from the different employments which are appropriate to men and women. And here, if we had space to develop it, we should find the ultimate solution of the whole woman question. For such, in general, are the differences established by God in the natures of man and woman, notwithstanding that, in defiance

of nature, some men may be womanish, and some women manish. Thus we see that the two sexes were created to live in organic relations to each other, as members of one organism, that is to say, in marriage, and that only in this relation can the highest development and well-being of either be attained.

In fine, the mutual attraction between the sexes is due to these counterpart differences, apart from which and from the mutual dependence and exchanges to which they give rise, there were no place for love or marriage. In consequence of these, the sexual attraction is the strongest of all, and the marriage union is the closest, the most intimate, the most perfectly organic, of all human associations. Here it is that the organic structure of society comes forth, and discloses its true nature, in its most typical form. For it is not, as is often supposed, those things in which men and women are most alike, but those in which they are the most different, which draw them together. The proverb that "like seeks its like" refers to more general resemblances than those now under consideration, such as those between creatures of the same species, apart from which, as we have seen, natural association cannot take place. But within the specific unity, it is contrast, rather than similarity, which is the great source of attraction between the sexes. Accordingly, it has been often observed, that marriages take place more frequently, are more fruitful and happy, and their offspring are more healthy in body and mind, between those who present strong contrasts, physical, intellectual and moral, than between those who most resemble each other. For where the husband and wife are very much alike in their endowments, temperaments, tastes and habits, as in the case of near relatives, the marriage is seldom a happy one, and the proportion of feeble, defective, deformed and idiotic children is greater than in other marriages. "Breeding in and in," as is well known, causes animals to

degenerate. "Crossing the breed" expresses a physiological law which is of no less importance for the improvement of mankind than of mere animals. This, surely, is a sufficient reason, though it is not the only one, for that prohibition of marriage between near relatives which we find in the laws of Moses, and in the codes of all civilized nations. Indeed, social arrangements to guard against such marriages extend almost as far back in time as we can trace the history of the human race.

Thus, we see, it is in and through these counterpart differences in persons and in their avocations that the organization of society develops and perfects itself. Wherever they are comparatively few and indistinct, there we always find societary attraction feeble, and a low grade of social organization; there the people are undeveloped or degraded, and often migratory in their character and habits, ready, on every slight occasion, to abandon country and kindred, and to form new associations. Hence the migratory tendencies of the Tartar and other nomadic tribes in all ages and countries. Hence those immense migrations of barbarians in the middle ages and in all preceding times. The great exodus of the Irish and Germanic peoples, in our day, is due to the loosening of the bonds of societary attraction from similar though not identical causes. In Germany, militarism, having come to predominate over all other social forces, acts as an electric battery to disintegrate society, and to expel the people from their homes and country. In Ireland, poverty has had much to do in producing a similar result, but this is not an adequate explanation. For there is nearly or quite as much pauperism in England, but the people do not emigrate in anything like an equal proportion. The more full explanation seems to be, that the diversified industries of Ireland have been destroyed by the oversliadowing competition of English manufactures brought to bear upon them through the existing political union between the two countries.

From this cause, the Irish have long been mostly confined to one form of industry, that of agriculture, in consequence of which, their individual differences have merged in one common type of degradation; for the emigrants are so much alike that no one can fail to recognize them wherever they are seen. Hence the decay of the organic structure of society, the loosening of the bonds of society, and the scattering of the Irish people over the world.

The organization of society perfects and crowns itself by that vast system of mutual exchanges between its interdependent organs which flows from their counterpart differences. We have a perfect type of these exchanges, as we have seen, in the human organism, wherein the hands provide for the mouth, the mouth prepares and passes the food to the stomach, and the stomach distributes it in the form of nourishment to all the other organs and parts of the body; wherein, also, the eyes direct the feet, the feet bear the eyes from place to place, the brain supplies intelligence to the body, and the body blood to the brain. The great organic law of the whole is mutual interdependence, the supply of the wants of each organ by exchanges with all the others. Such, also, is the law of human society in the degree in which it attains to fulness and completeness of organization. For the personal quality, or capacity, or development which is deficient in one individual is more than adequate in another, and the wants of those who are engaged in the production of any one commodity are supplied by those who produce other commodities. Thus every one is dependent for the supply of his deficiencies upon the others, and each contributes something to complete the circle of endowments and productions in the social organism. For as each member of the human, so each member of the social body is indispensable to the full and perfect life of the whole. This is limited only by the case of a diseased organ, that is, a bad member of society, who, for the welfare of the body, must, in extreme

cases, "be cut off from his people." But the analogy holds good here, as elsewhere, for the health and even the life of the human organism sometimes requires that a diseased member should be amputated, a diseased organ extirpated. Hence that deep and tender interest, as represented by St. Paul, which each member of society is bound to feel in the safety and welfare of all the others; for "if one member suffer all the members suffer with it." Here, also, we have the foundation of the great moral law: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Hence, in fine, we might anticipate what we always find, that only in the more highly organized communities is the life of the individual adequately protected: in low and feeble organizations, it goes for almost nothing. Recklessness of life, the bowie knife or the revolver always at hand, is an infallible sign of a low and feeble social organization, of an undeveloped or degraded humanity.

The exchanges which take place in the most highly organized societies are of various kinds, such as that of ideas, that of sympathy and affection, and that of services and commodities. In fact, the social life, in its whole development, is no less dependent upon the freedom, promptness and regularity of these exchanges than is the life of the human organism upon the circulation of the blood; and they are always the most free and prompt and regular where the differences in persons, employments and productions are most numerous, marked and most perfectly the counterparts and complements of each other. Each of these forms of exchange has its own place for detailed exposition in that vast scheme of social science which the analysis of the teleological organs of society will immediately give us; but here we can only touch, by way of example, upon the exchange of ideas, upon which depend, in a degree which cannot be overestimated, the increase and diffusion of knowledge, the development of the human faculties, and the progress of civilization. For it is the chief function

of oral speech, of writing and printing, and of language itself, as inclusive of all possible modes of symbolizing, representing and expressing thought. Intellectual life, no less than every other form of life in man, is essentially a communion. Thought is begotten of thought by mutual intercourse of mind with mind, nor does it pass beyond the embryo-state, until it is brought forth in words or symbols, so as to communicate itself to other minds. No man perfectly understands himself until he is able to make himself understood by others, nor fully believes in his own ideas until he is able to express them so as to convince others of their truth. For, in the words of Novalis: "It is certain, however it may be explained, that when I have won another to believe as I do, I believe more strongly than I did before." And by this form of exchange, the knowledge of each becomes available by all, and that of all by each, with comparatively little expense of time or labor. What I know I can communicate to another in a thousandth part of the time it has taken me to learn it, and that other, of course, can do the same for me. A bare hint is often enough to possess another mind with the fruitful germs of thought which it has taken the lifetime of the author to originate and develop. Thus all parties to such exchanges profit by what they receive, and still more by what they give; for here, as everywhere else, "it is more blessed to give than to receive." Thus all are enriched in a twofold manner, and enter upon a new course of acquisition with all the advantages of an intellectual capital derived from their social intercourse, to bring back again, from time to time, into the social circle their ever-increasing treasures.

It is in this way that the faculties of the members of a highly-organized community receive their richest nourishment and most varied culture, attain to their fullest growth, put forth their most beautiful bloom, and bear their noblest fruit. For the sum of knowledge in every

such society constitutes a common *pabulum* upon which the minds of individuals nourish themselves, or, to change the figure, their vital atmosphere by which they are invigorated, and their vision is extended and purified. From the almost infinite diversification of special studies and employments it results, that the knowledge of each individual upon any particular subject, such as health, agriculture, or maritime affairs, is immeasurably greater than it is where no one has ever made a specialty of medicine, farming, or navigation. And this difference, which is just that between civilization and barbarism, applies not only to individuals but also to nations which stand in organic relations to other nations, as compared with those which keep themselves insulated from the rest of mankind. For in the degree in which communion between the different nations becomes full and free, does the human race become one society, one organism, each member of which reaps the harvest of the studies, labors and progress of all the others. These relations, moreover, are not limited to any present time, but each succeeding generation inherits the accumulations of intellectual, moral and material capital which have been stored up in all the past: and, hence, progress in all the elements of wealth, that is, of well-being, must be recognized as a fundamental law of man's history upon the earth, than which no physical law is more amply verified and demonstrated by the number of facts which it co-ordinates and explains.

Thus far we have been chiefly occupied with the organic relations of the individual members or organs of society to each other, although this conception of the social organism is no less fruitful with respect to those between society itself and its organs. Here, however, we must content ourselves with two or three of the plainest inferences.

The first is, that the individual does not exist for himself, but for society, the organ for its organism. Consequently, every person is bound to have some higher ob-

ject of life than a merely selfish one, and this object must be the welfare of the community of which he is a member. This is the principle which justifies men in sacrificing their lives for their country; and the fact, that there have been so many and such heroic sacrifices for this object is abundant evidence that the principle lies deep in human nature, and often influences the actions of men, even where it has never been formally recognized by the intellect. Its practical application in matters of industry would lead to this result, that every person, whatever his avocation, would aim to produce something which would promote the general welfare and prosperity, and would account nothing else honorable or lawful, however much it might seem to be for his own selfish interest. For an organ which should aim to advance its own interest to the damage of its own organism would deserve and require to be exterminated. This grand result, however, belongs largely to the future of society, although the idea itself is a prophecy that one day it will be realized.

Our second inference is, that the organism of society is clothed with the power of government over its own organs. How far it may be wise to exercise this power is a large question which here we cannot undertake to discuss. Doubtless the individual should have all the liberty which is consistent with the welfare of society. But what these limits to the exercise of governmental powers are, it is for society, not for the individual, to determine. Also, these powers of government must be conceived of as extending to industrial matters, as well as to all others which are of general interest and concern. For what must we think of a man who should abnegate all control over his own organs, as to how they should be employed? Society, therefore, has a rightful authority to influence, by wise legislation and other means, the flow of industry; to "protect" and cherish any particular branch of production, such as that of food, clothing, leather, iron, ships, books,

for which the country may afford peculiar resources and facilities, and which would be everyway beneficial ; as, also, to prohibit and suppress other occupations which, though they may seem to promote the interests of individuals, are generally demoralizing and detrimental to society, such as gambling, lotteries, the traffic in intoxicants, and prostitution. That theory of civil government which requires that all industrial matters should be left to take care of themselves is irreconcilable with the conception of society as an organism, and it is one which is advocated chiefly by those who seek their own selfish interests at the expense of others, and by the strong in order that they may be left free to break down and destroy the weak.

Our third inference is, that society is bound to educate, defend and provide employment, where it may be necessary, for its members. For what must we think of a man who should neglect to educate and train his own organs to any useful work, or who should fail to see that they have work to do, or to defend them in their proper functions when assaulted by hostile forces, or who should renounce the care of them in disease and infirmity? We must think the same of every community which renounces or neglects these high functions and sacred duties to its members, for which society was instituted of God, and exists among men. For the right of the poor to labor is simply their right to live. And this idea strikes deeply into our present system of governmental education, which turns out our youth, at a time when they are exposed to their greatest temptations, utterly unskilled to do anything with their hands, with which the great body of them must earn their living, or starve, or steal, instead of teaching them some art or trade to enable them to support themselves by their honest labor.

We come now, in conclusion, to the analysis of the teleological organs of society, which are, as we have stated, the institutions that embody and represent the special aims or

ends of social life, and the means by which these aims are realized.

We observe, then, that the most general or comprehensive object for which society was instituted among men, is the welfare or well-being of mankind. For it originated, as we have seen, in the creation of woman, concerning which God said: "It is not good for man to be alone." It is true, this was spoken with primary reference to marriage, but yet to this form of association considered, not only in itself, but also as the fountain-head of those streams of life and population which contain the elements of all society. Now the well-being of man consists in the satisfaction of all his natural wants, and in the gratification of all his lawful and ordinate desires. These wants and desires, under a rigorous analysis, resolve themselves into six classes, comprehending six special aims of society, corresponding to which we have six classes of institutions for the attainment of these aims and the satisfaction of these wants. The first want is that of society itself, or social intercourse, which seeks its gratification through the institution of marriage and the offspring thence derived: the second is the want of education, which is supplied through the family and all other educational institutions; the third includes all the material wants, for the supply of which are all the institutions of industry; the fourth is the want of justice and order in society, to satisfy which is the great end or object of the institutions of civil government; the fifth comprises all those wants which spring from the love of the beautiful, and these seek their gratification through the institutions and appliances of art; the sixth is that of the religious wants, which are supplied through the institutions of religion. These six classes of institutions, for the reason that they represent the special objects for which society exists, are here characterized as its teleological organs.

1. The first of these is that of marriage, of which the

great end or aim is the pro-creation of human beings for the satisfaction of the want of society itself, and which, as it was the first in time, so also is it the first in importance, of all the social institutions. It was for this object primarily that God created man male and female, and blessed them, saying: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth." Hence the paramount importance of the institution, which is illustrated, also, by the subjects which are included under it, which are such as the following: The fundamental laws of marriage, as laid down in the word of God, and in the nature of man; its influence upon human well-being and happiness, according as these laws are observed, and the evils which flow from their violation by promiscuous intercourse, adultery, polygamy, intermarriage of near relatives, and unlawful divorce; population—the causes, laws and consequences to human welfare of its increase and decline; the organic nature of marriage, and the mutual exchanges to which it gives rise within itself, and in its relations to the other teleological organs. In the discussion of these subjects, we find that the true doctrine of marriage is the chief corner-stone of the whole edifice of social science.

2. The second of these teleological organs includes all the educational institutions of society, at the head of which stands the family. For the family cannot be comprehended in its true nature and objects otherwise than as an educational institution. This above all others is the object for which "God setteth the solitary in families." But education here must be taken in its most comprehensive sense, as that the object of which is to satisfy the human want of development—the development of all the physical and mental faculties, not only in children and youth, but also in men and women throughout the whole of life, and not only in individuals, but also in the race at large. Consequently the institutions of education are, not only schools, colleges and universities, but also learned societies, the

public press, lyceums, public lectures, and whatever is adapted to promote the increase and diffusion of knowledge and the development of the human faculties. Under this head we have, therefore, a vast range of subjects, the interest of which is constantly increasing, and which have never yet been treated as a whole. These are such as the following: The organic nature of the family and of all other educational institutions in their interior relations, in those which they bear to the other teleological organs, and to society itself; the education of children and youth of both sexes, together with the methods and means by which this object can best be attained; the education of adults, the chief object of which is the development of particular faculties and special aptitudes for the practice of different trades, arts, professions and pursuits, together with the means by which this object can be the most perfectly realized; in fine, the education of society itself, regarded as a self-perpetuating and ever-progressive form of organic life, the object of which is the development and culture of humanity to its highest attainable perfection and final destiny.

3. The third of these organs includes all the institutions of industry for the satisfaction of the want in man of material well-being. This form of wealth resolves itself, in the last analysis, into human control over the forces of nature and the properties of matter; and the attainment of it is the third special aim of society, as Divinely prescribed to man in the words: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Here nature in its utmost extent is given to man, and he is commanded, through his associated energies and activities, to subdue it to his own uses and ends. Thus he is authorized by his Maker to acquire and possess material wealth, and is directed to the only source from which it can be procured, that is, the subjugation of nature. The sub-

jects included under this head, together with those under the first, constitute nearly the whole of that special department of social science which is called political economy. Those which require to be enumerated here are the following: The nature of material wealth; value and its measures; the distinction between national and individual wealth —the former consisting in the sum of utilities, the latter in values; the production of wealth, the wealth-producing power, that is, labor, skilled and unskilled, free and slave; division and organization of labor; the industrial arts, capital and wages; the instruments of production—tools, machinery and the domesticated animals; agriculture, or the occupation and improvement of land, the production of food and raw materials, land-tenures and rent; mines, forests and fisheries; manufactures, or the production of finished commodities; the distribution of wealth—commerce, home and foreign trade, free-trade and protection, diversification of industry, political and industrial independence of nations; roads, canals, rivers and harbors; the media of exchange—money, credit, banks; checks upon the production and distribution of wealth, such as war and taxation; the organic relations of all the institutions and branches of industry to each other, to the other teleological organs, and to society itself as the all-comprehending organism.

4. The fourth in order of these organs includes all the institutions and appliances of art, that is to say, the beautiful or fine arts, the object of which is the satisfaction of those wants in man which arise out of his susceptibility to the charms of beauty. Under this head we have the following and kindred subjects: The importance of art-culture to the welfare, happiness and perfection of man; the influence of poetry, music, sculpture, painting, architecture, the drama, public spectacles and amusements upon individual and national character; means for the promotion of art, and for the culture of the esthetic faculties;

the significance of great municipal and national monuments of art, and its organic relations.

5. The fifth of these organs includes all the institutions of civil government, the object of which is the realization of justice, order and general prosperity in society. In this department of social science, we have the following and kindred subjects: The nature, objects, powers and functions of government; laws—municipal, constitutional, international; the history of government from its origin in tribal associations through all its successive developments and forms—patriarchal, monarchical, despotic, aristocratic, republican, democratic and mixed; the progress of civil liberty, development of free institutions, and the organic relations of this to the other organs and to society, and of the different nations of the world to each other.

6. The sixth and last of these organs of society comprises the institutions of religion. For religion is an essential and fundamental element of human nature, and the want of communion with God is an original want of the human soul, without the supply of which never yet has it been, nor ever can it be well with man. Religion, moreover, is essentially a social principle; pre-eminently the religious life as a communion; solitary asceticism is a wretched abuse of the moral and spiritual nature. Hence it is one of the special aims of society to make provision for the supply of this want by institutions for social worship, and for the communion of the worshippers with each other. Under this head, although it has never before been included in any scheme of social science, we have all the subjects which pertain to religion socially considered.

The foregoing analysis of the lawful and ordinate wants of man in the supply of which his welfare consists, and of the corresponding aims of society to supply these wants, and of the organs or institutions which embody and represent these aims, and through which they are realized—this analysis is intended to be exhaustive, and to furnish

a scheme for the classification and exposition of all the phenomena of organic society. For there is no social fact or interest which does not naturally range itself under one or other of these comprehensive divisions. Of course, however, it does not lie in the power of any one man to fill out this vast scheme.

Ach, Gott, art ist lange und kurtz ist unser leben!

The laborers also as yet are comparatively few in this great harvest-field; but they are constantly increasing, and each one who faithfully cultivates any little nook or corner of it contributes something to the crowning result, which must in time be realized. Hitherto, indeed, in this, as in every other department of knowledge, human progress has been painfully retarded by an enormous growth of premature theories, with comparatively but little of harvested truth; for crude theorizing has distorted, perverted, and even denied many of the most obvious and significant facts of social life. But all this must in time give way to the scientific methods of observation and induction, which have already led to the most encouraging results; nor have we any reason to doubt but that this most comprehensive and most human of all the sciences will prove hereafter as productive of welfare and blessing to mankind as it is now full of promise and of hope.

XV

POPULATION

And God blessed them: and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.

THIS fruitfulness which was conferred on the first human pair, and through them upon mankind, is here declared to be a blessing. That it is truly such would seem to be indisputable when we consider that life is the one indispensable condition of all other blessings. Yet, perhaps, there is no declaration of the word of God against which more has been written, or which is still more confidently denied. For it has been strenuously maintained, and it is yet extensively believed, that this fruitfulness of the human race is a tremendous curse, and the cause of almost all the pauperism and degradation in the world. In support of this view, it is claimed by a whole school of political economists, that the constant relation between the natural increase of population and the possible supply of food is such that the earth's productions necessarily tend to become less and less adequate to the support of its inhabitants. But we affirm that this statement rests upon mere speculation and analogy, and is contrary to all the facts of human experience; and this, we are persuaded, can be shown to the satisfaction of every candid mind.

In the first place, then, there is a strong antecedent probability against this speculation. In other words, there are rational grounds for a strong presumption that the Creator and Father of mankind, in His infinite fulness of wisdom, power and goodness, 'whom giving does not impoverish

nor withholding enrich,' has made ample provision for all the real necessities of His human children. This presumption, moreover, is confirmed by the acknowledged fact, that all these wants, unless that of food be an exception, have been actually provided for with a bountiful liberality. For the human powers of procreation are acknowledged to be ample for the supply of man's want of society, or communion with his kind. For the satisfaction of our intellectual wants, we have all the facts and laws of nature, and the whole universe of truth and possible knowledge, in which no one has ever been mad enough to anticipate any deficiency. And for the supply of our moral and spiritual wants, we have all God's revelations of himself and of the spiritual world in His word, in His works of creation and providence, and in our souls—revelations which are absolutely inexhaustible. In fine, with respect to all our other physical wants, no deficiency of supply is ever supposed. All analogy, therefore, seems to warrant us in the belief that our heavenly Father has made provision for this lowest yet most urgent necessity—that of food—with equal liberality. It seems irrational and even monstrous to suppose that an inordinate bounty on His part in supplying man's want of communion with his kind should have led Him to endow the procreative powers in such excess that all the treasures of the earth, air and waters must be totally inadequate to the supply of food, and that consequently an ever-increasing proportion of human beings must perish from starvation.

This argument, however, is only presumptive, and may not be regarded as sufficient to refute the analogies on which the counter-presumption of necessary starvation is itself chiefly founded. Among these, that which has exerted the greatest influence of late is drawn from the lower organisms—animals and plants—among which, it is urged, "a struggle for existence" is constantly going on, in which all the weaker organisms perish, and only the stronger

survive. This has been exhibited in elaborate detail by the followers of the late Charles Darwin, and by himself as follows:

"A struggle for existence inevitably follows from the high rate at which all organic beings tend to increase. Every being which, during its natural lifetime, produces several eggs or seeds must suffer destruction during some period of its life, or during some season or occasional year; otherwise, on the principle of geometrical increase, its numbers would soon become so inordinately great that no country could support the product. Hence, as more individuals are produced than can possibly survive, there must in every case be a struggle for existence, either one individual with another of the same species, or with the individuals of a distinct species, or with the physical conditions of life. It is the doctrine of Malthus applied with manifold force to the whole animal and vegetable kingdoms; for, in this case, there can be no artificial increase of food, and no prudential restraint upon marriage. Although some species may be now increasing more or less rapidly in numbers, all cannot do so, for the world would not hold them."*

Now, although this may all be true of the lower organisms, it does not follow that it must be true of the highest of all, that is, man. If there be in the human world a struggle for existence similar to that which is here represented as prevailing in the animal and vegetable kingdoms, it must be proved by other arguments than this, and by such as are very different from any which analogy can furnish. For, evidently, there may be good reasons why it should prevail in the lower, and not in the higher realms of organic life; and one reason for the creation of lower organisms in such numbers that they cannot all live is obvious, namely, that vegetables are intended to serve as food

* Darwin's *Origin of Species*, p. 63.

for animals and men, and animals as food for men and for each other. But human beings are not created to become food for each other, nor for the animals. For aught that appears, they were intended to live out the full term of their natural lives. The analogy, therefore, does not warrant us to anticipate anything like so high a rate of increase for human beings as for other creatures. Accordingly we actually find it an indisputable law of organic development, that the lower forms of life increase and multiply with immensely greater rapidity than the higher. For no human pair can produce more than a few offspring, whilst a single fish-spawn contains literally millions of germs. Also we find that, among animals themselves, those which serve as food for others have commonly a higher rate of increase than those which prey upon them. The Greek historian, Herodotus, has an observation upon this point which seems worthy of being reproduced here; for in explanation of the causes which prevented the rapid multiplication of serpents in Arabia, he says: "I myself have observed this law of animal life, that the wise providence of God has made those creatures which are good for food very fruitful, as the hare, but those which are noxious, incapable of rapid multiplication, as the lion."* For these and other similar reasons it may be, notwithstanding this analogy, that the human powers of procreation shall be found at last no more than adequate to supply the want of society, and to "replenish the earth and subdue it."

In the above quotation from Darwin, this theory of the relation between population and food is called "the doctrine of Malthus," for the reason that it originated with that celebrated author. But Malthus does not base it upon the preceding analogy, although, since his day, this has contributed more than all other arguments to its credibility and acceptance. He lays it down as a principle which

* *Herodotus*, Book III. 107–109.

requires no proof, that the production of food can never increase faster than in an arithmetical ratio, *i. e.* as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6; and that population naturally increases in a geometrical ratio, *i. e.* as 2, 4, 8, 16, 32. Now this principle is assumed by all his disciples as incontrovertible. We here deny it in both of its branches. We affirm that it rests upon purely speculative and hypothetical grounds. It has never been proved—the proof of it has never been formally attempted—it is incapable of proof. For, in the first place, no one has ever attempted to determine, in a scientific manner, the law of increase in the production of food of which the earth, air and waters are capable. The loose and general statements of Malthus himself do not even suggest the possibility of a scientific solution of the problem; and he makes no account whatever of the vast resources of modern agricultural chemistry, nor of the atmosphere as an inexhaustible storehouse of nourishment for the support of organized beings, of which he was necessarily ignorant. Nor have his followers, strange as it may appear, contributed anything to supply his deficiencies in this respect. For aught that appears, then, the increase in the production of food may be much greater than in an arithmetical ratio. In the second place, there are a great many natural checks upon the increase of population, from which no portion of the human race has ever been free, and which have never been determined in their number and efficiency. In the present state of our knowledge, they are incapable of being so determined. How, then, is it possible to establish a law of the increase of human beings in circumstances in which they have never been placed? Hence, for aught that appears, their natural increase may be much less than in a geometrical ratio.

But, if it be conceded that the procreative powers of mankind, being conceived of as adequate to populate the whole earth from a single pair, must needs, if unchecked, tend to over-population, it does not follow that the required

restraints must come from the want of food. For other checks, which are in constant operation, may be amply sufficient to the end of time; and, if not, others still of greater efficiency may be developed as population advances. The all-wise Creator, who, by the operation of His immutable laws, stored away the coal in the earth thousands of years ago to meet the want which should arise from the destruction of the forests, and the rock oil to be discovered when the whale should have begun to disappear, may have implanted in the human constitution itself just those checks upon the increase of population which may be required hereafter, and which shall be developed at the proper time, when the waste lands of the globe shall be fully occupied and tilled to their utmost capacity of production. Some such pre-arrangement would be in perfect analogy with the wonderful facility which the physical constitution of man has always exhibited in adapting itself to the ever-varying circumstances and conditions of his earthly life, and is just what we might expect from the infinite wisdom, power and goodness of his Maker.

The advocates of this doctrine, however, shut themselves up within much narrower limits than would be allowed them by the geometrical ratio of the increase of population and the arithmetical ratio of the increase of food. They undertake to show that this latter can never be so great, except, perhaps, for a very short time, and in exceptional circumstances, and that all the resources of emigration, whilst the greatest abundance of unoccupied land remains, are totally inadequate to supply the want of food which arises from over-population. These views are founded upon a certain theory of the rent of land, which was broached by obscure writers who preceded Malthus, which was adopted by him, and which was subsequently taken up by Mr. Ricardo, and formulated with detailed applications. Hence it has come to be almost exclusively associated with Ricardo's name. Presented in his own words, it is as follows:

"On the first settlement of a country in which there is an abundance of rich and fertile land, a very small proportion of which is required to be cultivated for the support of the actual population, or, indeed, can be cultivated with the capital which the population can command, there will be no rent; for no one would pay for the use of land when there was an abundant quantity not yet appropriated, and, therefore, at the disposal of whosoever might choose to cultivate it. On the common principle of supply and demand, no rent could be paid for such land... When, in the progress of society, land of the second degree of fertility is taken into cultivation, rent immediately commences on that of the first quality, and the amount of that rent will depend on the difference in the quality of these two portions of land. When land of the third quality is taken into cultivation, rent immediately commences on the second, and it is regulated as before by the difference in their productive powers. At the same time, the rent of the first quality will rise, for that must always be above the rent of the second by the difference between the produce which they yield with a given quantity of capital and labor. With every step of the progress of population, which shall oblige a country to have recourse to land of a worse quality to enable it to raise its supplies of food, rent on all the more fertile land will rise."*

Such, then, is Ricardo's world-famous theory of rent, which has been vaunted by great authorities as the most important contribution to political economy made since the time of Adam Smith, and upon which this doctrine of starvation is founded. J. Stewart Mill, one of the most authoritative writers on this subject, speaks of it in the following words: "This general law of agricultural industry is the most important principle in political economy.

* *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*, by David Ricardo, Esq., London, 1817, pp. 52–55.

Were the law different, nearly all the phenomena of the production and distribution of wealth would be different." Let these statements be borne in mind, for if it can be shown that there is no such law, the whole system of the production and distribution of wealth which is here founded on it must fall to the ground.

Now the first and most obvious objection to it is, that it is altogether hypothetical and speculative, a pure *á priori* hypothesis, an assumption without a shadow of proof. Its authors and supporters rest it wholly on the antecedent probability. They simply assert that men, being rational, would choose and settle first on the richest lands; therefore they always have done, and always will do so. Not one of them seems ever to have thought of examining into the history of new settlements to see in what order superior and inferior soils have actually been occupied. If they had made such an historical examination, they would have found, as we shall presently see, that their assumption was directly opposed to all the facts of the case. Here, then, is a great system of political economy vauntingly founded on a purely speculative notion, an unwarranted assumption.

The second objection is, that a precisely opposite assumption may be made to appear quite as plausible, and, indeed, far more probable, on similar *á priori* grounds. Let us look at some of these for a moment.

For when men come to settle in new countries, they are necessarily few in numbers, and are comparatively destitute of capital and the appliances of civilization. If the first occupants be a tribe of savages, which commonly has been the case, they support themselves by hunting and fishing, after that by pasturage, and do not till the ground at all, or only in the feeblest manner. Under such conditions, population is necessarily very sparse. For it has been roughly computed that one half-acre of cultivated land will furnish as much food as eight hundred acres of forest and stream to hunters and fishers. When cultivation begins

under any circumstances, farming implements are of the rudest construction, and even these are difficult to be obtained. The sparseness of population precludes the massing of numbers in co-operation for the accomplishment of great agricultural enterprises. Consequently, the first practical question for new settlers is, not where they can find the deepest and richest soils, but where it is possible for them, with their rude implements and paucity of numbers, to overcome the resistance of nature, and to eke out a bare subsistence for themselves and their families. And this resistance of nature is always greatest where her strength is greatest, *i. e.* where the soil is richest. Dank and pestilential vapors fill the valleys, whose natural growths also are the heaviest timber or impenetrable jungles, the cover of ferocious beasts and noxious reptiles. Here a vast work of clearing and draining must be done before the soil can be rendered productive of food for man, to which the force of new-settlers is totally inadequate; and if it were otherwise, they and their families would probably be cut off the first year by the malaria which floats along the sluggish streams. The next best soils extend for some distance up the sides of the valleys and lower slopes of the hills. But, here also, the timber is commonly too heavy to be cleared away by the new-settler's imperfect tools and inadequate force of numbers. Hence, whatever may be his wishes, he is compelled to pass by these also, and to commence the work of cultivation upon the light and thin soils of the upland slopes, where there is no malaria, no heavy timber, nor thick jungle, where no drainage is required, where the soil can be immediately worked with his inadequate force and implements, and where it will afford him the speediest though scanty returns—" returns, however, which are immeasurably in advance of all that could be obtained by his savage or nomad predecessors, who roamed over a thousand times greater space, and depastured the natural grasses with their flocks and herds."

Now 'it is the first step which costs.' For when the new-settler's first crop is gathered from his thin soil, he has, notwithstanding, a store which will last him till the next harvest, and which gives him some leisure to improve his tools and accommodations. This improvement, and the natural increase of his live stock, render the next year's labors somewhat more productive: and thus, year by year, he is enabled more thoroughly to till the ground, still further to improve his agricultural implements, to clear more and better land, and to extend his plantation. In the meantime, his children are growing up around him, taking part in his labors, and increasing his force, by whose aid he is now enabled to clear away heavier timber, and to bring under cultivation deeper and richer soil. Thus we see that, as population advances from generation to generation, the progress of settlement and tillage is naturally from lighter and poorer soils to those which are heavier and richer, which extend down into the swamps and bottoms of the valleys. The richest lands, where the strength and resistance of nature are greatest, where a gigantic work of clearing and draining is indispensable, must needs be the last which are reached, when population has become the most dense, and appliances of civilization the most numerous and efficient.

Such, in brief, is the *á priori* argument which is opposed to the assumption upon which Ricardo's theory is founded. Certainly it is no less probable than that which it is adduced to refute, and a system of political economy of an entirely opposite character might be as legitimately built upon it. But, thus far, we have only one *á priori* theory set off against another; and whatever is worthy of the name of science can make no further use of such speculations than to raise from them the inquiry whether the conclusions to which they point are, or are not, in accordance with observed and verified facts. Hence it is necessary to inquire here, what has been the actual history of new set-

tlements? Do the facts of the case show that they have been made on the richer or poorer soils? Have increasing populations proceeded from the former to the latter, or from the latter to the former?

The first writer who undertook to submit Ricardo's theory to the test of facts was Henry C. Carey. In his *Principles of Social Science*, he has given us a vast historical induction, in the course of which he traces the history of new settlements in the United States and their territories, in Mexico, South America, the West Indies, Canada, Great Britain, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and most other countries, wherever any facts bearing on this subject are accessible. It is impossible here to do any sort of justice to this splendid historical argument. It should be read and studied by every one in the author's own works. But a few indisputable facts, as examples, may be here enumerated.

In England, then, those parts of the country which, in the time of Richard *cœur de lion*, were forests and swamps are now under the highest and most productive cultivation. The morasses of South Lancastershire, which had nearly swallowed up the army of William the Conqueror, are now among the most productive lands of the kingdom. The Lincoln Fens, which Cromwell tried to drain by the labor of his Dutch prisoners, and failed, together with the border counties between England and Scotland, which two centuries ago were the haunt and refuge of "the bold moss trooper," are now drained by wind and steam hydraulics, and are proverbial for their fertility. Everywhere the lands most recently brought under cultivation are those which have required the heaviest outlay of capital, especially in the form of machinery, to reclaim them. Such lands, in general, were totally irreclaimable before the invention of the steam-engine. Even on the prairies of the United States and Territories, where there is no timber nor jungle, it is found that the lightest soils

are first occupied, and the heaviest not until population has much increased.* In general, we find on examination of the facts that the most productive soils are not brought under cultivation, except where population has become dense; where it is sparse, tillage recedes from the river-banks, and runs along the ridges and crests of the hills; in proof of which, we see, also, that the old roads wind from hill-top to hill-top, regardless of the increased distance, and of the labor of ascent and descent, connecting the scattered villages and sparse settlements: whilst the modern railway connects great cities, plunging through forests and swamps, wholly or comparatively destitute of population, which, however, soon follows its course, until the jungle and timber are cleared away, the swamps drained, and villages, towns and cities take their place. In this way, the deepest, heaviest and most productive soils are last brought under cultivation.

The result of this examination demonstrates that Ricardo's theory of the occupation of land cannot stand the test of indisputable facts, and that its precise contrary is true. This conclusion, moreover, is confirmed, and the whole Malthusian doctrine of starvation is refuted, by another class of facts of still greater significance. These are brought out by the question, whether increasing populations have actually produced and enjoyed a decreasing proportion of food for each mouth? For it is easy to show that precisely the opposite of this is true.

Ricardo's theory, then, as applied by himself and ac-

* "The soil of the dry prairie is from twelve to eighteen inches deep... the wet prairie in general much deeper, and the alluvion of the river-bottoms often of astonishing depth.... To constitute dry prairie it must be rolling. Between the waves of this great ocean .... are the sloughs, the terror of the early emigrant, and the most valued possession of his successor.... These sloughs are the drains of the dry prairie.... Many small tracts known as wet prairie fifteen years ago, and rejected by the first settlers, are now brought under cultivation."—*Report of the American Pomological Society*, 1849.

cepted by all Malthusians, gives us the following results: A colony, suppose of one hundred persons in families, settle in a new country on the richest land it affords, which yields them, for the first crop, say, 1000 bushels of wheat, ten bushels for each mouth. In 25 years, the population, say, will have doubled, which will require them to cultivate a double portion of land, the additional part of which must, of course, be of inferior quality. This yields, say, 900 bushels, giving for the whole crop 1900 bushels, and but 9.5 bushels for each mouth. Another 25 years, population again doubled, amounting to 400 persons, requiring double the quantity of land, the addition being of still inferior quality. The whole crop now is 3500 bushels, yielding 8.75 bushels for each mouth. Still another 25 years, population 800, food 7.8 bushels for each mouth. Thus we have a constantly decreasing proportion of food as population advances. Now all this is on the most favorable supposition which the theory allows, namely, that each person of the 800 occupies as much land as did each of the 100 at first. But if the land be limited in quantity, so that the increased population cannot obtain as much of it as their ancestors occupied, this decrease in the proportion of food for each mouth must be in so far accelerated, and, still further, by the tendency (assumed by all these writers) of cultivation to exhaust the natural fertility of the soil. Such are the inevitable and acknowledged consequences of the theory.

Now, upon examination of the facts of the case, no such consequences appear in the history of increasing populations, but the contrary, namely, that increasing populations produce an increasing amount of food for each mouth. Here, also, Mr. Carey has given us a vast and splendid historical induction, of which only a few facts can be mentioned here as examples.

Upon this question, we have the best information concerning France from the time of Louis XIV, 1700 to

Louis Philippe, 1840, a period of 140 years, for which the tables compiled by the head of the statistical bureau of the government give us the following facts: 1. The whole population of the country nearly doubled—lacking only 3,000,000. 2. The whole product of food nearly quadrupled: in other words, a population less than twice as dense produced four times as much food, and, consequently, more than twice as much for each mouth.

But it is of importance, also, that we should know how this increased product of food was actually distributed, and what, during this time, was the condition of the poor. From these tables, then, we find that the landlords and capitalists received in 1700 for their share of the whole product, two-thirds of it, or twice as much as the laborers, the actual tillers of the soil, whilst, in 1840, these latter received three-fifths of the whole, one-fifth more than the landlords and capitalists. This, however, does not indicate that the landlords received less in absolute amount; for so great was the increased production during this interval that in 1840 two-fifths of the whole were far greater in absolute amount than were three-fifths in 1700. Notwithstanding, or rather because the laborers were so much better paid, the absolute amount received by the non-agricultural portion of the people increased one hundred and twenty-seven per centum, whilst their numbers had only doubled. Again, the whole cost of cultivating the soil during this period, increased more than seven fold; the proportion of this which was paid in wages nearly doubled; the proportion for each individual nearly trebled; and the daily wages received by each individual of the agricultural families nearly quadrupled. Once more, the wages of an agricultural family in 1700 were one hundred and thirty-five franks per year, whilst the cost of wheat enough to give them bread was two hundred and fifty-four franks, leaving a deficit to be made up with acorns, chestnuts and other such materials of one hundred and nineteen franks, while the wages of such a family in

1840, were five hundred franks, and the cost of wheat enough to give them bread, was two hundred and fifty-six franks —an excess of wages over the cost of bread of two hundred and forty-four franks, to provide them with clothing, shelter, and other necessaries.

Thus it appears that under Louis XIV the rural population of France wanted bread half the time; intermediate statistics show that under Louis XV they had bread two days out of three; whilst under Louis Philippe, they had bread every day, and a constantly increasing surplus of wages for other necessaries. It is true, indeed, that during all this time they had food of some sort, at least, those of them that escaped starvation. But their bread was made of inferior grains, of chestnuts, acorns, fern, and even worse materials; nor could they obtain enough of these to prevent multitudes of them from perishing. One of the ministers of Louis XV has left the following record: "At the moment when I write, in the month of February, 1739, with appearances promising a harvest, if not abundant, at least passable, men die around us like flies, and are reduced by poverty to eat grass:" and the Duke of Orleans carried a loaf of fern-bread into the king's council to show his majesty what his subjects lived upon. Few persons now are aware upon what wretched food the masses of the people lived in "those good old times."

In these tables we have also a comparison between the more and the less populous districts of France, with similar results. We cannot go over these details here. It must suffice to state that they show a constantly increasing proportion of food produced, and actually distributed to each person, as the population increased in density, and a decreasing proportion as it became more sparse. In the words of a French economist: "If we compare together the ten most populous and the ten least populous departments, it appears from official statistics that, in the former, the yield for each person is more in quantity and better in quality to

the extent of thirty per centum in weight of grain than in the latter; and there is a similar disproportion in all other products besides grain." Thus we see that, in those portions of France where the population was most dense, there was produced about a third more food for each mouth than in those where the population was most sparse.

With respect to the other European countries, we have not such full statistical information, but we have a vast body of general facts which necessarily involve similar results, and some of these are more significant than any yet given. Thus the following statements are from Adam Smith, the founder of political economy as a science, although some of them are well known to all readers of general history: "Under the feudal governments, the tillers of the soil were commonly bondsmen, or tenants at will. Both their persons and services were at the disposal of the feudal lord, to whom, therefore, all the produce belonged. But, in the present state of Europe, the share of the landlord seldom exceeds a third, sometimes not a fourth part. Yet the rent of lands, that is, the share of the whole produce received by the landlords, in all the improved parts of the country, has tripled and quadrupled in absolute amount since the ancient times; and this third or fourth part received by the landlords is, it seems, three or four times greater than the whole formerly was. Rent, though in the progress of improvement, it increases in absolute amount, diminishes in proportion to the whole produce of the land." Hence it follows that the other two-thirds or three-fourths of the whole produce, which do not go for rent, remain to be divided between the farmer and the laborer; and this must be six or eight times greater than the whole formerly was, whilst the population of no country in Europe is three times as great as it was five hundred years ago.

From the statements of Malthus himself, forty years after Adam Smith, it would appear that the whole product

of the soil, and the proportion of it received by the laborers, had still further increased during that interval of rapid improvement. For he states: "According to the returns lately made to the board of agriculture, the average proportion which rent bears to the whole produce seems not to exceed one-fifth; whereas, formerly, the proportion amounted to one-fourth, one-third, or even two-fifths. Still, however, although the landlord has a less share of the whole produce, this less share, from the very great increase of the whole which has arisen from the progress of improvement, yields a larger quantity." Now, if one-fifth, at this time, was greater than two-fifths had been formerly, the whole product was more than doubled; and, of this whole, four-fifths were received by the laborer and farmer: all this in the face of what his theory required. How this inconsistency is disposed of we shall see hereafter—it is not the least wonderful thing connected with the subject.

In like manner, Mr. Senior, one of the ablest of this school of economists, in 1836, thus estimates the improvements which had taken place in England and in the southern parts of Scotland during the preceding sixty years: "Population doubled, wages of labor more than doubled, rent nearly trebled," *i. e.* in absolute amount.

These are only a few examples of a vast multitude of facts which have been adduced in disproof of this theory, that increasing populations must necessarily produce a constantly decreasing quantity of food for each mouth; and these are crowned by one acknowledged fact, which we claim is sufficient itself to refute the theory, and to overthrow the whole system of political economy which is founded on it. For the most populous of the countries of Europe is Belgium, and it is an undisputed fact, that the economic condition of the people of that country is the best in Europe. There pauperism and distress from want of food are almost unknown. Enough and more is

produced and distributed to all the inhabitants, and large quantities are constantly exported. Here, then, we have a demonstration that there is no such thing as over-population in Europe; and that, wherever pauperism exists, it is due to other causes, namely, to false and wrong social arrangements. For even in the great Irish famine, during which, perhaps, a million of human beings perished from starvation, the exportation of food from the country in large quantities was constantly going on. It was not that Ireland did not produce food enough for its inhabitants that they perished, but because they had nothing to buy it with; and the reason of this was their want of a sufficiently diversified industry, which had been destroyed by free competition with the more advanced industries of England.

Here, now, the question arises, how do the Malthusian economists deal with these facts? The answer is, that they frankly admit them, and undertake to reconcile them to their theory. Some quotations to this effect have already been given. In addition, Mr. Senior states: "Since the beginning of the eighteenth century [136 years] the population of England has about doubled; the produce of the land has certainly tripled, probably quadrupled." Also Mr. McCulloch says: "Let any one compare the state of this, or any other country of Europe, with what it was 300 or 100 years ago, and he will be satisfied that prodigious advances have been made; that the means of subsistence have increased much more rapidly than population, and that the laboring classes are now generally in possession of conveniences and luxuries that were formerly not enjoyed by the richest lords."

These admissions, however, as has been said, are not understood by these economists to invalidate the *á priori* theory to which they have been so long and so fully committed. They seem to believe that one theory is worth a thousand facts, and if the facts cannot be made to square

with the theory, so much the worse for the facts. Thus Mr. Mill, admitting that the facts of modern times are against the law of decreasing food, goes on to say: "This, however, does not prove that the law of which we are speaking does not exist, but only that there is some antagonizing principle at work, making head against the law. Such an agency there is in habitual antagonism to the law of diminishing returns from the land. . . It is no other than the progress of civilization." [sic]. But he comes to the conclusion that this law, constantly operating, must in time overcome the "antagonizing principle." So also Mr. McCulloch: "From the operation of fixed and permanent causes, the increasing sterility of the soil is sure, in the long run, to over-match the improvements that occur in machinery and cultivation."

Now these statements are little less than prodigious. For, here, it is flatly conceded that this boasted law does not hold good in an advancing civilization; that, for more than two centuries of the most rapid increase of population ever known, the progress of civilization has been more than a match for it. What, then, becomes of it in all past time if, in the human race taken as a whole, civilization has always been advancing? And what becomes of it for the future if civilization should continue to advance? The former of these suppositions is now almost or quite universally maintained by scientists, and certainly the latter is incapable of being disproved. Here, then, this boasted "law of diminishing returns from the land" is conceded to be no law at all of the actual facts, but something which might, could, would or should be a law, if it were not for —what? Why, the progress of civilization, forsooth! A great system of political economy vauntingly based upon a purely speculative notion, and one which confessedly ignores the progress of civilization! Is this anything less than prodigious?

Moreover, on this starvation-theory, it is impossible to

understand how civilization should ever have made any progress, or ever have come to exist. For if, in the case supposed, we allow that eighty of the one hundred settlers on the best land of a new country are sufficient to work the soil, twenty are left to make and improve tools and other appliances, to attend to the education of the youth, and the other requirements of civilization. Now, at every advance which they make to poorer soils, as their numbers increase, they must occupy a greater proportion of land for each person in order to produce a sufficiency of food, and this necessitates that a constantly increasing proportion of their numbers should employ themselves in tillage, leaving a constantly decreasing proportion for other kinds of industry, whilst the population necessarily becomes more and more sparse. At first, then, we have twenty out of the one hundred for these other appliances of civilization; at the second stage, there will be but fifteen, at the third ten, and soon none at all; but every human being must work in the fields to procure a bare subsistence; which must fail, at last, and the feebler begin to die of starvation. Thus, at every successive stage of the occupation of new and poorer land, and of the relatively decreasing returns from it, we have less and less force available for study, invention and general improvement, that is, for the progress of civilization. How, then, is it conceivable that it should ever have made any progress? According to this theory, it must have been always and everywhere retrograding, with ever-increasing destitution and misery. But, inasmuch as it is impossible to deny that progress has been made, at least during the last two centuries in Europe, these writers are compelled to treat it as an accident, which is subject to no law, and admits of no rational explanation. And this, forsooth, they call social science!

Here, then, we recall the words of perhaps the very ablest expounder of this system of notions and fallacies: "This law [of decreasing returns from the land] is the

most important position in political economy. Were the law different, nearly all the phenomena of the production and distribution of wealth would be different." Well, we see here that the law is different—there is no such law—it is purely imaginary—the precise contrary is the true law of the facts of the case. New settlers begin with the lighter soils, because they are the most easily worked. As population and force increase, as tools, machinery, and other appliances are improved, they advance to soils of superior strength and fertility, where the resistance of nature is greater, but which they are now able to overcome: whence an increase of food for each individual, and an increased proportion of their numbers released from the work of tillage to employ themselves in study, education, invention, and all that belongs to a progressive civilization. This is the law of the facts, from which it follows, by inevitable necessity, that "nearly all the phenomena of the production and distribution of wealth" are "different" from the exposition of them which is made in the works of these authors. In fact, this whole system is nothing but the blossom and fruit of bad economic arrangements. Malthusianism is simply an attempt to justify theoretically these false and wrong social arrangements, with all their necessary consequences of pauperism and starvation.

In addition to all that has just been stated, there are two points which hitherto have scarcely been alluded to, and which are worthy of particular attention.

The first of these is, that, by "the law of the decreasing fertility of the soil," these authors do not simply mean that ever poorer and poorer land is occupied as population increases, but, also, that the constant and necessary tendency of agriculture is to exhaust the soil of its natural fertility. They assume that it has a certain natural amount of productive power, and that, upon the whole, this is in a normal process of exhaustion. Either they are ignorant of, or they have a sublime contempt for all inquiries into the sources from

which the earth derives its fertility, and all the vast results of modern agricultural chemistry. Now these inquiries have lately poured a flood of light on this whole subject; they have taught us that the earth draws her fertility chiefly from the atmosphere, and that the atmospheric supplies are inexhaustible. For the growths of the earth take from the soil not more, on an average, than two-tenths of their substance; at least eight-tenths are drawn immediately from the atmosphere. Hence the crops, as they are consumed upon the soil, deposit in it something less than eight-tenths of their substance, which was not there before. And it makes little difference how they are consumed, provided it be not by fire, in which case, all that is taken from the atmosphere escapes back again into it in a free state. Also, when they are consumed in any other way, there is still some tendency to such escape—the amount deposited in and retained by the earth is something less than-eight tenths. It is in this way that the deep and rich soils of the prairies and steppes have been formed, that is, by the annual decay for thousands of years of the natural grasses, and by the deposition in the earth of a large proportion of their substance drawn from the air. Hence it is the natural tendency of the increase and decay of organized beings, both plants and animals, to enrich the earth, to render it ever more and more productive. Whenever any portion of it is impoverished under agriculture, this takes place by the removal and consumption of its growths away from it, and by neglect to make the proper returns in the form of manures. Otherwise, it is the natural tendency of agriculture to enrich the soil year by year. And thus, with respect to this element of "the law of the decreasing fertility of the soil," it is found to be no law at all of the actual facts, but the reverse is true.

The second point which has been omitted respects the normal relation which subsists between the increase of population and that of wealth in civilized countries. For

the Malthusian economists lay it down as a principle that the increase of wealth is measured by the rate of interest which money commands. They do, indeed, qualify this statement by such general additions as that the government must be liberal, and property well secured. But they unhesitatingly apply it to England, France, Germany, the United States and Canada. There is not, indeed, as usual, the least foundation for this notion, as Adam Smith would have taught them, if they had not long ago repudiated the authority of their great master, for he expressly states that "the rate of interest is naturally low in rich countries, and high in poor countries, and it is always highest in the countries that are going fastest to ruin." But this is characterized by Mr. McCulloch as a most erroneous statement, adding: "We have no hesitation in laying it down as a principle which holds good in every case, and from which there is really no exception, that, if the governments of any two countries be equally liberal, and property in each equally well secured, their comparative prosperity will depend upon their rate of profit," *i. e.* upon the rate of interest on capital. The truth is, however, that in all industrial countries where money is loaned for investment in productive enterprises, the rate at which wealth increases is far greater than that of the interest on borrowed capital, otherwise it could not be so employed with profit to the borrowers.

But, now, let us assume this wholly inadequate measure for the increase of wealth, and compare it with the increase of population. The highest rate of the increase of population known in any country is that in which it doubles every twenty-five years, which is less than three per centum per annum. But three per centum is a low rate of interest on capital; yet, at this rate, wealth doubles in less than twenty-three years. We see, then, that, at this extremely high rate of the increase of population, and at this low rate of the increase of wealth, the latter would always

keep in advance of the former. With the rate of interest at five per centum, wealth, in twenty-five years, would amount to nearly three and a half times what it was at the commencement of this period, whilst population could not be more than doubled. In another twenty-five years population might be four times as great as at first, but wealth would have increased between seven and eight times. Now the increase of population in such old and well-peopled countries as England and France has hardly ever been greater than one per centum per annum, whilst the rate of interest for money has fluctuated between three and five per centum. In such countries, at the rate of two per centum the increase of wealth would always keep it far in advance of population. But the actual increase of wealth in these countries has been, for the last two centuries, from ten to twenty per centum: and, in the present state of the world, wealth, of whatever kind can always be converted into food.

Here, then, we have, from conceded data, a demonstration that distress from want of food and pauperism in England and other industrial countries have literally nothing to do with over-population, but are wholly due to other causes, that is, to a totally inadequate distribution of the wealth which is actually produced.

We come now, in conclusion, to the moral consequences of this utterly groundless theory, which can be fully appreciated by those who do not claim to be experts in social science.

The first of these is, that all attempts to relieve the distress of the poor, whether by poor-laws, charitable institutions, or charity in general, are contrary to the laws of nature, and can never fail to increase pauperism and all the evils which they are intended to mitigate. This consequence is fully admitted by all Malthusians. Mr. Malthus himself, indeed, being a clergyman of the Church of England, could not tell us, in so many words, that we must never give a shilling to a starving beggar, but he develops in detail the evil effects of such relief. He tells us

that every increase of food thus supplied to the poor stimulates the increase of population, and every increase of population increases the evil of pauperism. Now the influence which such a doctrine must exert to harden the hearts of the rich and well-to-do against the poor is obvious. It brings man's noblest sympathies into direct conflict with his social duties, which, of course, require him to do nothing to increase the enormous evils of pauperism, and, consequently, never to bestow charity, which cannot fail to increase these evils. This, surely, is a detestable doctrine to every man that has a human heart.

The second of these consequences is, that a very large proportion of mankind must be deprived of the blessings of marriage and the family. This, also, is admitted and avowed by Mr. Malthus and all his followers. For they earnestly exhort the poor to remain unmarried, as their only hope of escape from starvation. Now it is appalling to contemplate the practical results which must inevitably follow such a general violation of the laws of nature. For if there is anything certain, it is that the well-being of mankind can never be generally realized out of the marriage relation. What would men become but for the purifying influence of women in married life, and apart from the educating, ennobling intercourse with their children and families! Impurity, more widespread and desolating than any that has ever been known, except on heathen ground, could not fail to be the result. Promiscuous intercourse of the sexes, from which mankind, as it would seem, have slowly emerged,* would return, with all its horrors. The work of two thousand years of Christian civilization would be undone. The world would be engulfed in perdition.

A third consequence of this theory is, that it promotes

* See *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity*, also, *Ancient Society*, by L. H. Morgan, LL.D.—the former work published by the Smithsonian Institution.

all those abominable means of frustrating the course of nature in the production of human offspring, and goes far to justify infanticide itself, which have so extensively prevailed among the heathen, and which are now returning upon us in the midst of our Christian civilization. Thus, as we learn from our tables of vital statistics, there is a steady decline among the native people of New England in the number of children in each family, and in the number of births compared with the number of deaths. Formerly the general average of children in a family was from eight to ten. In one small town there were at one time 1043 children in 90 families—an average of between 11 and 12. In the present generation, there are not more than three in a family. In 1864, among the native population of the state of Massachusetts, the deaths exceeded the births by 9000; in Boston alone, by 1502. Now, for any community to be in a prosperous condition in this respect, the annual birth-rate must be as high as one to thirty of the adult population; but, among the natives of that state, it is less than as one to sixty. Hence it would appear that this old Puritan stock is disappearing from its native seats at an appalling rate. Much of this is due, no doubt, to the large emigration of the young people to the new states of the west. But this fact can have no bearing upon the decrease of children in each family. Upon this point it is significantly asked by one who has studied these tables: "What cause or causes could ever bring about such disastrous results?" And he answers: "The whole explanation may be summed up briefly under two heads: 1. The physical degeneracy of women, and 2, the settled determination among a large portion of them in married life to have no children, or a very limited number. No language" he adds, "can adequately portray the terrible effects which have already resulted from these violations of law; and no imagination can fully comprehend the disastrous consequences which are yet to

follow in the same train." * Infanticide, also, is now prevailing among the laboring poor in England to such an extent that the statistics of the subject are kept as much as possible from the public. "Wife-killing is one of the most common crimes, next to infanticide, which has become so common as scarcely to be considered a crime." †

Now, these horrible practices, with all their results, are the natural consequences of this Malthusian theory. For it insists that the one thing to be avoided, for the welfare of the human race, is the increase of population, because, if children are born in natural numbers, the greater portion of them must perish from starvation. Hence it comes to be regarded as a mercy to prevent them from coming into the world, and when they do come, to remove them out of it as early as possible. If these views should come to control legislation, who does not foresee that infanticide will cease to be a punishable crime, and will be regarded among us as a praiseworthy act, as it still is by the most degraded of the heathen?

The last and most fatal consequence of this theory is, that it tends to subvert all faith in the authority of Holy Scripture; it is diametrically opposed to the word of God. For God has given to mankind, and that in the form of a blessing, the command to "be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth," whilst this theory teaches us that the greatest curses we suffer arise from the natural increase of population, and enjoins upon the largest portion of the human race to eschew marriage, and thus to frustrate their natural fruitfulness. God has placed all men in families, and these authors would deprive most of them of this purifying and blessed influence. God has enjoined charity to the poor, and here we are taught that it is an unmitigated curse which can never fail to increase the evils of pauperism and degradation. God has said, "Thou shalt

* *New York Observer*, Oct. 4, 1866. † *New York Times*, Dec. 27, 1867.

do no murder," and here we have the murder of infants, both before and after birth, legitimated, and rendered practically inevitable.

It was in view of these moral consequences chiefly that Carlyle was accustomed to characterise political economy as "the dismal science," and that Coleridge left upon record the following indignant condemnation of this whole theory of starvation:

"Is it not lamentable—is it not marvellous—that the monstrous practical sophism of Malthus should now have gotten complete possession of the leading men of the kingdom! Such an essential lie in morals—such a practical lie in fact, as it is too! I solemnly declare that I do not believe that all the heresies and sects and factions which the ignorance and the weakness and the wickedness of men have ever given birth to, were, all together, so disgraceful to man, as a Christian, a philosopher, a statesman, or a citizen, as this abominable tenet. It should be exposed by reasoning in the form of ridicule. Asgill or Swift would have done much; but, like the popish doctrines, it is so vicious a tenet, so flattering to the cruelty, the avarice, and sordid selfishness of most men that I hardly know what to think of the result."

Coleridge's Complete Works, Vol. VI. p. 412.

XVI

THE MORAL DIFFICULTIES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so.

NOTHING is gained, but much is lost, by unwarranted claims in behalf of a good thing. Such claims, it will hardly be denied, are not infrequently made even for the Holy Scriptures; and, in so far as this is true, its influence must have tended to weaken rather than to strengthen their authority. In fact, it has proved a great obstacle to the faith of multitudes. For, just as the attempt to interpret the Scriptural allusions to physical phenomena by the results of modern science has been a fruitful source of scepticism and infidelity, so the groundless assumption that the morality which was freely tolerated under the Old Testament dispensation must be regarded as on a par with that of the New, has loaded them both with a weight which neither of them was ever intended to bear. Hence the whole subject of the relations between these two portions of the sacred canon requires to be thoroughly reworked, if God would only send us a man capable of doing it any sort of justice. Meanwhile, all that we can undertake here is, to throw a little light on it for the relief of Christian faith from some of those moral difficulties which are deeply felt by almost all students and readers of the Bible.

But, before entering upon this discussion, in order to guard against misunderstanding, we take occasion to declare the faith which we hold in common with all good Christians, that both the Old and the New Testament Scriptures are, in their substance and true import, and in

a sense which can be predicated of no other writings, the word of God. For, beyond controversy, this has been the faith of the church ever since these books have been in her possession; and it is a faith which has become so inrooted in the Christian mind, and so inseparably identified with the growth and progress of all that is worthy to be called civilization, that we have no fears of its ever being eradicated. It is like the granite which underlies the superincumbent strata of the globe—it is like the foundations of the great mountains which defy the earthquake. It will take a great deal more than even modern scepticism has ever dreamed of to overthrow it.

The evidences upon which this faith rests are, when duly appreciated, well nigh overwhelming, and such as can never lose their force. The claims to Divine inspiration which the sacred writers make for themselves with such unwavering assurance; the corresponding simplicity and elevation of their style; their moral characters and manifest aims to do good; the consciousness of God, in His holiness, justice, truth, goodness, mercy and love, which they everywhere express; the exalted character of the revelation which they represent Him as communicating through them to mankind; the unity of purpose and of doctrine which runs through so great a number and variety of authors for so many ages; the spirit of prophecy which they constantly breathe; the boldness of their almost innumerable predictions, which are such as no men in their senses, without the consciousness of supernatural illumination, would ever have dared to hazard; the wonderful fulfilment of these prophecies, especially those concerning the advent and sacrifice of Christ; the miracles of the Lord and His apostles, above all, His own resurrection from the dead, as certified by unimpeachable eye-witnesses; the difficulty of imagining that He himself was either an impostor or a fanatic; the experience which the church has had for so many ages of the power of the Word to enlighten, purify, comfort and save;

the fulness with which it satisfies all man's spiritual wants; the influence for good which the Christian religion, as based on revelation, has always exerted in the world—such considerations as these do constitute a body of evidence for the Divine authority of the Scriptures, which, as it never has been, so can it never be, without the greatest weight and force with unprejudiced and reasonable people.

Besides all this, which is equally good for both the grand divisions of Scripture, we have, for the New Testament, all those full and unambiguous assurances of supernatural enlightenment which the Lord gave to His apostles, such as the following: "When they deliver you up, take no thought [be not anxious] how or what ye shall speak, for it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.... When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth... He shall testify of me... He will guide you into all truth... He will show you things to come." For although these promises are by no means to be restricted to the apostles and writers of the New Testament, yet in reason must they be understood as applying, in an eminent manner, to these chosen teachers and evangelizers of the world. And the inspiration thus guaranteed to them must be conceived of as of a superior order, in certain respects, to that of the Old Testament, inasmuch as, previously to the fulfilment of these promises on the day of Pentecost, it could be said, comparatively, that "the Spirit was not yet given." Accordingly, the authors of the New Testament claim to speak and write with all fulness of Divine revelation; and this claim is abundantly substantiated, not only by their miracles, but, also, and perhaps with even greater force, by the unparalleled moral and spiritual revolution which their writings and influence have wrought in the world.

Then, with respect to the inspiration of the Old Testament, it is supported by all the authority of the New, so

that both must stand or fall together. For but one meaning can fairly be drawn from such declarations as the following: "The testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy. . . . Prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. . . . All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Besides these and many other passages of similar import which might be cited, the Lord himself frequently appeals to the Old Testament, as of Divine authority, expressly naming David as having spoken in the Psalms by the Spirit, and, together with Moses and Daniel, as having prophesied concerning himself. Hence the above-cited passages from the writings of Paul and Peter and John must be understood to express the views which the apostles were instructed by their Divine Master to hold and teach. He, therefore, who gives up the inspiration of the Old Testament is logically bound to give up also that of the New: he who loses faith in Moses and the prophets will hardly be able to maintain his faith in Christ.

With this summary statement of our faith, and of some of the grounds on which it rests, we proceed to exhibit our method of dealing with the moral difficulties of the Old Testament which it has to overcome, and to which we shall freely concede whatever force they can reasonably claim. The statement of these difficulties will come up in order as we undertake to grapple with them; but here, at the outset, we would lay down and establish the fundamental principle by which, in most cases, we propose to solve them. This may be stated as follows: The moral and spiritual light of the New Testament is superior to that of the Old, in which latter, the revelations were not complete nor final, but partial, in great part provisional, and necessarily accommodated to the low intellectual, moral and spiritual condition of the times, and of the people to whom

they were originally communicated.* We shall find that this principle rests, not only upon the reason of the case, but also upon the authority of the apostles and of the Lord himself.

There was, then, an unavoidable necessity for such accommodation of Old Testament revelations to the capacities or susceptibilities of the people to whom they were originally communicated. For it is certain from all human experience, that truths, ideas, and even rules of moral conduct which present no difficulties to people of developed and cultivated faculties, cannot be received nor even comprehended by those who, comparatively, are in a low state of intellectual culture and moral sensibility, such as, beyond a question, was that of the Israelites in the time of Moses. For they were a vast horde of newly emancipated slaves, or, at best, a nation just escaped from centuries of degrading and corrupting bondage among a people wholly given to the grossest idolatries and superstitions. Consequently, it could not have been otherwise than that they should be incapable of receiving those high and pure and spiritual revelations of God and Divine things which are given to us in the New Testament. These would have made no impression upon their unsusceptible faculties—upon what Christ called 'the hardness of their hearts'—for which reason, as he explained to the Pharisees, they were accommodated by Moses, in one case at least, with an inferior rule of moral conduct—a significant case, which will come up again in the sequel. A national education

* "God revealed His truth in the Old Testament to the world according to its needs in such language and such modes of thought as it could understand. We need not regard this language and these modes of thought as the most perfect from our stand-point; but they were perfect in their adaptation to the needs of the generations who were immediately addressed. . . God's revelation in the Old Testament is only preparatory, and pales before that in the New. . . His revelation in the Scriptures is like that of the sun, whose coming is heralded by the gray tints of the morning, before he bursts in full-orbed splendor on mountain and meadow."—Prof. S. I. Curtiss in the *Presbyterian Review*, July, 1882, p. 581.

for fifteen hundred years in the doctrines of the unity of God and of the expiation of guilt by a sin-bearer, and in many other particulars, was indispensable to prepare them for the reception of the Gospel as it should be revealed, in due time, by the Lord and His apostles; the proof of which is, that God actually subjected them to such a course of training and preparation under the moral and ritual laws which He gave them, the ministry of their prophets, and the discipline of their wonderful providential history. And, thus, in the fulness of time, they were actually prepared for the superior light of the new dispensation.

But this principle does not rest upon the necessity of it as evinced by human reasoning, but upon the authority of Christ and His apostles, by whom we find it clearly stated, strenuously defended, and copiously illustrated, in explanation of the difference between the old and the new dispensations. Thus St. Paul informs us, that "Moses put a veil over his face," that the people whom he led "were under a cloud," that "their minds were blinded," that "a veil was upon their hearts .... so that they could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." Now such declarations can hardly be understood otherwise than that Moses could not tell his people—and if he had told them they could not have received what nevertheless is plainly true—that the revelations delivered by him were incomplete, provisional, and destined to be supplemented, and in part superseded, by more full and perfect disclosures in the future. For if they had been informed that such was the nature of his communications, they could not have received them as of binding moral obligation, nor have observed them with that diligence which was necessary to their disciplinary effects. As a matter of fact, they did receive them as a complete and final revelation of the character of God, and of the way of salvation, and this was the great error which continued to blind their minds long after it should have given place to

the enlightenment of the gospel, and which opposed the greatest obstacle to the labors of St. Paul for their conversion. God seems to have regarded this error as less deleterious than the consequences which would have resulted from a full disclosure by Moses of the provisional character of his laws and institutions.

We come now to exhibit in exemplary particulars the incompleteness and provisional character of the Old Testament revelations, together with the manner and degree in which they are affected, modified, and in some cases even superseded, by the superior light of the New. We may anticipate that, in this procedure, we shall find the principle just laid down still further confirmed, not only by its adequateness to the solution of our difficulties, but, also, and most of all, by the use which is made of it for this purpose by the Lord and His apostles.

In the first place, then, the moral law itself, as delivered by Moses, although it embodied and represented the eternal truth of the Divine justice, yet, as a revelation of the character of God and of the way of salvation, was incomplete, and required to be supplemented by the gospel. For in connection with it, the grace and mercy and love of God are not exhibited with that fulness and glory with which it sets forth His severity in the punishment of sin: nor was the way of escape from its dread penalties—the way of salvation by grace—represented to the people under it otherwise than in obscure symbols and adumbrations, which required the epistles to the Romans, the Galatians and the Hebrews subsequently to interpret and explain. The character and spirit of the law are expounded by St. Paul in such words as the following: "The soul that sinneth it shall die . . . . Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Now it is evident from these and a multitude of similar declarations, that in the law there was set forth a way of salvation which was, and is, and forever must be,

wholly impracticable for sinners, because it requires that they should not be sinners, and which was never intended to save them, but rather to convince them of the utter impossibility of their being saved by their own works or agency. Hence, also, it is elsewhere characterized by the same apostle as a "ministration of condemnation" and even of "death," whose chief object was to prepare the people for that ministration of life and peace which was yet to come, and by which, in its Old Testament relations, it was to be superseded and done away. Notwithstanding, in all this, God was revealed to the people of that dispensation in those traits of his character which were specially adapted to their spiritual wants in their low moral and spiritual condition.

Now, the spirit of the gospel is very different, and in certain respects the reverse of this. For its general tone is not that of penalties and curses, although these, as belonging to the eternal justice of God, are by no means wanting, but, rather, that of promises and blessings. When Christ opens His mouth to declare the law in its utmost spirituality, streams of blessing pour forth from his lips: "Blessed are the poor in spirit... Blessed are they that mourn... Blessed are the meek... Blessed are they that do hunger and thirst after righteousness... Blessed are the merciful... Blessed are the pure in heart... Blessed are the peacemakers... Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake... Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake.... God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life... God commendeth His love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us... When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth His Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the

adoption of sons: and because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts crying, Abba, Father." Here, now, the grace and mercy and love of God, which were veiled under the law, are fully disclosed; and here a way of salvation which is practicable for sinners is laid open. For here God is revealed, not as inflicting the penalties of His violated law upon us, but as giving His Son to die that we might be delivered from them: and it is by faith in this most holy sacrifice, and in the character and love of God which it reveals, that we are delivered from the claims of the law, as a condition of our acceptance with Him, and are brought under the immeasurably deeper and stronger and more tender and effectual obligations of grace and love on His part, and of love and gratitude on ours. In what respect, also, this way of salvation is the reverse of the legal way appears from this, that in the law God said to the people, Obey me, and I will love and bless you; but, if you disobey me, I will curse and destroy you: conversely in the gospel He says to us, You have already transgressed my law, and incurred all its penalties; nevertheless I still love you with an inalienable love, and have given mine only begotten Son to redeem you from the curse of the law by bearing it himself—therefore, now, from motives of love and gratitude, you are to love me, and keep all my commandments.

But, for this full unveiling of the character of God, and for this way of salvation by grace and faith, the people of the old dispensation were not prepared—therefore, it was not given to them. The gospel fulness and freeness of God's love for sinners they could not bear—they would have perverted and abused it by reason of 'the hardness of their hearts'—therefore, it was withheld from them. How, then, it may be asked, could any of them be saved? The answer is, that they were not left in entire ignorance of God's grace and mercy—far from it. For the penitent and believing among them had always a refuge from the

condemnation and penalties of the law in the sacrifices which God had ordained to be offered for their sins. These were to them, in some sort, what the sacrifice of Christ which they typified is to us. For when they confessed their sins over the sacrificial victim, symbolically putting them upon its head, and the victim was either slain and consumed in the fire, or sent away into the wilderness where it could never more be found—what could they have understood from these Divinely ordained and expressive symbols but that their sins were forgiven, and should never more be brought against them? These, therefore, were God's means of communicating to the pious and godly among them the forgiveness of sins and peace of conscience. But it is hardly conceivable that such typical adumbrations should have taught them more of gospel truth than we ourselves could have gathered from them, if we had been left without the explanations which we have in the New Testament. In fact, the incompleteness of their knowledge is strongly represented in the words of the Lord himself to His disciples: "Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see, for I tell you that many prophets and kings have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them, and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them." Hence, also, St. Paul could declare in words the significance of which is strangely overlooked by those who persist in ascribing New Testament light to the people of the old dispensation, that "before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." For in what conceivable sense could he say, "We were kept under the law," except that the legal dispensation in general was still in force? And how could they be "kept. . . . shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed," if salvation by grace and faith had been fully made known? To the same effect also is the declaration of St. John: "The law was given by Moses, but grace

and truth came by Jesus Christ;" and again, "The darkness is past, and the true light now shineth."

Since, then, the Gospel, as distinguished from the law, was thus imperfectly made known to the people of the legal dispensation, it is evident that all other communications made to them, on whatsoever subject, had to be conformed to their imperfect knowledge upon this point. Accordingly, in the Old Testament, especially in the writings of Moses, the motives of hope and fear are addressed by considerations mostly of a temporal character. The patriarchs are never spoken of as having gone to heaven after death, but only as 'gathered to, or as sleeping with their fathers'. Hence the faith of immortality, although it certainly had some influence, must have been, as evidently it was, comparatively, a feeble element in the spiritual life of that dispensation. In the darkest hours even of the most eminent saints, it seems to have failed them altogether. Thus David, praying to be healed of some threatening illness, adds: "For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the state of the dead, who shall give thee thanks?" And the same darkness seems to have overshadowed the faith of the pious king Hezekiah in his song of thanksgiving for his miraculous restoration to health, where he says: "The dead cannot praise thee; death cannot celebrate thee. The living, the living, he shall praise thee, as I do this day." Hence, also, the apostle Peter breaks forth in thanksgiving as follows: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to His abundant mercy, hath begotten us again to a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven." And St. Paul declares concerning the superior light of the New dispensation on this subject, that it "is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." Hence, again, in what sense could

it be said that immortality had been brought to light through the gospel and the appearing of Christ, if it had been fully revealed before?

Now, from all this it follows by necessary consequence, that the revelations given in the Old Testament require, in all our interpretations of them, to be modified by those which the New Testament supplies. And if we take them without such qualification, as declarations of absolute truth, which is the view which seems to have commonly prevailed, our knowledge of God and Divine things must be, as was that of the Old Testament people, extremely one-sided and defective. For so great is the effect produced upon the incomplete by the complete disclosures of the truth that St. Paul could represent the one as, in some sort, abolished by the other, as his words: "When that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away."

In the second place, there is a moral difficulty which arises out of the provisional character of the ritual law, but for which, it would be unnecessary to say here that this law, with its priesthood and sacrifices, its tabernacle and temple worship, and all its rites and ordinances, was a temporary arrangement, which was destined from the first to be superseded and wholly done away by a subsequent revelation. For its priesthood, though ordained of God, had no inherent validity, nor otherwise than as typical of the priesthood of Christ. Its sacrifices had no efficacy, otherwise than as typical of that one 'offering of the body of Jesus Christ,' which alone could be a valid atonement "to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins... The first tabernacle... was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience—which stood only in meats and drinks and carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation... For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin... For by

one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

But, that this was the character of the ritual law was not, and could not be revealed to the people who were placed under it. For if they had been capable of the clear knowledge of what it typified, they would not have needed its educating influence, and if they had known that it was only a temporary and provisional arrangement, they could never have been induced to observe it. How is it conceivable that they should have borne its vast expense and intolerable burden and "yoke," as St. Peter calls it, if they had known that it had no inherent efficacy, and that its sacrifices did not, and could not take away their sins? Consequently, Moses gave them no hint that such was its character. He himself could hardly have known that it was ever to be abolished; for if he had known it, he would have been altogether an unsuitable organ and instrument for its delivery and enforcement. Accordingly he everywhere spoke of it in the strongest terms, as if it were to continue forever: "The Lord spake unto Aaron, Behold, I have given the charge . . of all the hallowed things of the children of Israel . . unto thee I have given them . . and to thy sons forever. . . Their anointing shall be an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations. . . . This day of atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins, once a year, shall be an everlasting statute unto you. . . Ye shall keep the passover a feast to the Lord throughout your generations by an ordinance forever." It is to such unqualified declarations as these that St. Paul evidently refers in the words: "We use great plainness of speech, and not as Moses, which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." And no wonder they could not, for so thick and impenetrable was this veil that it required the labored epistle to the Hebrews, and, indeed, the whole of the New Testament, to make the light

of the gospel shine through it. Even St. Peter, after all the personal instructions of the Lord, and the pentecostal illumination, had his mind so clouded by it that it was found necessary still further to enlighten him by a Divine vision, that of the sheet let down from heaven. Nor was even all this sufficient, for multitudes of Christians during the first century, under the stress of these Mosaic representations, still felt themselves obliged in conscience to be circumcised and to observe the ritual law.

Now, from all this it seems plain enough that the people of the old dispensation must have understood that this law was of moral and permanent obligation, and that they received the forgiveness of their sins through its sacrifices in a sense in which we, with our New Testament light, know that this was impossible. And such views must have carried with them very much lower and less spiritual conceptions of the character of God, and of Divine things in general, but, especially, of the nature of sin, than those which are brought to light in the gospel. When it was revealed that God could no longer be acceptably worshipped with such sacrifices, a flood of new light was poured upon His character, upon the spirituality of the worship which He required, and upon all questions of practical morality. When it was made known that the sacrifices of the ritual law could never take away sin, that sin could be atoned for by nothing short of the sacrifice of the only begotten Son of God, then and thereby was it declared to be a spiritual abomination and an unfathomable evil, such as had never before been conceived of by the human mind. This it was which brought out, as it had never been done before, 'the exceeding sinfulness of sin,' and the awful nature of the punishment which, in the sight of God, it deserved. Hence such New Testament expressions as 'the worm that never dies . . the fire that never shall be quenched . . the weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth forever.'

The moral difficulty which arises out of all this is ex-

pressed in the question, how are all these declarations that the law was ordained as "an ordinance forever" to be justified, when it was intended to pass away? In answer to this, it has been said that no rigorous stress is to be laid on the words "everlasting" and "forever," because they are as frequently used to express times of indefinite length, of which no termination can be foreseen, as they are in their literal import. Again, it may be said that those spiritual things of which the rites and observances of the law were typically significant, *i. e.*, its very heart and substance, apart from which it really had no meaning, and to impress which upon the minds of the people it was ordained, shall never pass away, but shall continue literally forever. Neither of these answers, however, can be regarded as altogether satisfactory. The true solution of the difficulty, beyond a question, lies in that trait of the Divine character, too much lost sight of, which is expressed in the words of Solomon, the wisest of mankind: "It is the glory of God to conceal a thing." For the educating influence of this law was indispensable to prepare the people for the gospel, and this influence could not be brought to bear upon them—they would never have endured the intolerable burden, as we have seen—if they had been given to understand that it was only of temporary obligation, and was destined to be superseded by a future revelation. Now, if it was right to put them under this preparatory discipline, of which there can be no question, then was it right to withhold from them whatever knowledge would have rendered it incapable of being enforced. The one must be held to justify the other.

In the third place, God evidently regarded it as indispensable to the great objects which he designed to accomplish through the instrumentality of the children of Israel, that they should be separated as completely as possible from the rest of mankind, and be to Him a peculiar people. This rigorous sequestration under which He placed them,

as we now understand, was for the purpose of educating them, during what St. Paul calls their childhood and minority, in preparation for the advent of their promised Messiah and the gospel dispensation: in other words, that the germs of Divine truth which God had planted in the soil of Abraham and his seed might be protected and cherished, as in an inclosed nursery, until they should take firm root, and grow up into a tree of life which the wild and brutal nations—the *goiim*, or heathen—should not be able to uproot nor cut down.

This separation of Israel from the heathen, being thus indispensable to the accomplishment of the Divine purposes of grace and salvation, must be accepted with all its necessary consequences, which are very numerous and of great significance. For, among them, we have the command given through Moses to exterminate the inhabitants of the land of Canaan, which has always been felt as one of the greatest moral difficulties of the Old Testament. This command was delivered in such words as the following: "When the Lord thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee . . . and when the Lord thy God shall deliver them before thee, thou shalt smite them and utterly consume them—thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them. . . Thou shalt consume all the people. . . Thou shalt destroy their name from under heaven. . . Thou shalt save nothing alive that breatheth. . . Thine eye shall have no pity upon them." The Israelites themselves were threatened with similar destruction, if they should fail to execute these terrible injunctions: "But if ye will not drive out the inhabitants of the land from before you, then . . . it shall come to pass, that I shall do unto you as I thought to do unto them." Hence their zeal in this work of indiscriminate slaughter, of which we have abundant evidence: "And Israel vowed a vow unto the Lord and said: If thou wilt, indeed, de-

liver this people into my hand, then I will utterly destroy their cities. And the Lord hearkened to the voice of Israel, and delivered up the Canaanites, and they utterly destroyed them and their cities ... Joshua drew not his hand back wherewith he stretched out the spear, until he had utterly destroyed the inhabitants of Ai ... They utterly destroyed all that was in the city [of Jericho] both man and woman, young and old ... We ... utterly destroyed the men and the women and the little ones of every city."

Now the difficulty here is, not whether it was right on the part of God, thus to exterminate root and branch a people whose cup of iniquity was full to overflowing. Of this there can be no question with any who believe in a Divine providence. For these nations, like Sodom and Gomorrah, Pompeii and Herculaneum, were actually destroyed under His providential government and ordering of human events. But the difficulty is this: How the giving of such commands to His moral creatures—how His requiring of them to slay without pity such multitudes of their fellow-creatures, including of necessity the aged and infirm, parents and children, nursing mothers and infants at the breast, women with child and in their travail sorrows—how all this is to be reconciled with the character of God as revealed in Christ, and, especially, with the law of love to our enemies, and pity for the feeble and suffering. Nor do we write for those, if any such there be, who cannot feel that there is any difficulty here.

Here, then, we frankly concede that it may not be possible, in the present state of our knowledge, to give a solution of this difficulty which shall be perfectly satisfactory. For we are surrounded with mysteries in the providence of God which no created mind can fathom. But it affords us some relief when we consider, that this destruction of the Canaanites was a solemn judicial act, on the part of God, upon a people whose moral corruptions were such

that their continued existence in the world could no longer be tolerated; and that the Israelites were simply His instruments for the execution of this judgment, and were abundantly instructed so to regard themselves. Also, it is a further relief when we consider what has been already suggested, that all this was a necessary consequence of that separation of the covenant people from the corrupting influence of the heathen which God had ordained as indispensable to their success in making preparation for the coming of Christ, and for the blessings of the gospel. In fact, its justification is placed by God himself on this ground where he says: "Thou shalt consume all the people..... They shall not dwell in thy land, lest they make thee to sin against me; for if thou serve their gods, it will surely be a snare unto thee." And so it proved in all their subsequent history, in so far as they failed, as partially they did, to execute this judgment upon the heathen inhabitants of the land. At the same time, we must not forget that the highest and purest laws of morality had not yet been revealed, nor could be, as is proved by the fact that they were not, until the time should come when this outward sequestration of the covenant people should cease. Hence the commands which were given them on this subject, as upon all others, had to be accommodated to the degree of moral light which they were capable of receiving, and could not go beyond it. This whole transaction, therefore, is to be regarded as belonging to a low moral condition in the people; nor is it conceivable that God should give any such commands now to those who have been enlightened by the gospel: "For the darkness is past, and the true light now shineth."

But, in order to understand more fully how the people of those times could give themselves up, without misgiving and so heartily as they did, to this indiscriminate slaughter, we must apply to the fact of their separation

from the heathen those words of St. Paul which have been cited in another connection: "Moses put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." For they remind us that, in this case as in the preceding, the lawgiver could not tell his people, and if he had told them they could not have received it, that this separation was a temporary arrangement; that the partition-wall between Jew and gentile, which God himself had built up, was destined to be broken down. The gospel truth, that the gentiles were to be fellow-heirs with Israel in the great salvation, could not be revealed to the people of the old dispensation, whilst the necessity for keeping up the separation between them continued. It is true, they had glimpses and adumbrations of it, as in the promises to Abraham, that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed, which were more fully unfolded by the later prophets; but these foreshadowings, though clear enough to us from the light of the gospel and from the history of their fulfilment, were not understood by the people of those times, nor, it is safe to say, was it intended that they should be; for if they had been, that would have effectually broken down this partition-wall before it had ceased to be indispensable for the protection of the infant church. We see that this must have been the result when we remember, that this wall was built up, in great part, of distinctions between clean and unclean animals for food and sacrifice, together with a vast system of ritual observances, including circumcision, all having reference to ceremonial purity, by which the people were prevented from eating and drinking, intermarrying, and otherwise associating with the heathen. Now, if they had been given to understand that all these distinctions and rites were of a merely positive and temporary character, and would all be abolished by a future and higher revelation; that unclean animals were not such in their own

nature; that swine as such were as pure as lambs, or turtle-doves; is it conceivable that they could have been induced to observe this law of distinction, with all its burdensome inconveniences, for so many ages, until they should come to abhor swine's flesh, as they do to this day? And what must have become of their separation from the heathen after its principal support had thus given way, and they had come to understand that it too was destined to be abolished? Hence there was an unavoidable necessity that they should not be informed of this gospel truth concerning the gentiles: and, that they were not, we have crowning proof in the words of the great apostle of the gentiles himself, who speaks of it as "the mystery which, from the beginning of the world, hath been hid in God .... the mystery which hath been hid from ages and generations, but now is made manifest .... the mystery of Christ, which, in other ages, was not made known to the sons of men as it is now revealed to His holy apostles and prophets, that the gentiles should be fellow-heirs and of the same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the gospel."

Since, then, it was necessary that this great truth should be veiled from the people whilst they were under the law, all other revelations, as in the former case, had to be conformed to their ignorance on this point. Hence the evangelical command to go forth and disciple all nations could not be given to the church of the old dispensation. It was no part of her duty to "preach the gospel to every creature." To her the gospel itself was very imperfectly revealed. It is true that some evangelical light—twilight rays from the Sun of righteousness to herald the brightness of His rising—did fall, from time to time, upon the minds of the prophets, and enabled them to anticipate, in a manner, that God would gather unto himself a people out of the whole world. But, as the prophets were understood by St. Paul, they did not foresee "that the gentiles should be fellow-

heirs and of the same body" with the covenant people—that the distinction between them should be done away. And whilst it was necessary that this distinction should be kept up, no communications from God on other points, with respect to His character, attributes, purposes, or providence, could be allowed to withdraw this veil which Moses had put over his face. God could not be represented to His chosen and peculiar people as the God of other nations in the same sense in which He was their God, or, if that expression be too strong, as bearing those relations to all men which are brought out in the New Testament. Other nations must needs be spoken of as, in some sort, aliens and outcasts, as the enemies of God and of His people.

Now, in consequence of this necessary veiling of the truth upon this point from the people who slaughtered the Canaanites, they did not, and could not feel towards other nations as we are instructed and required to feel by the Lord and His apostles. In their eyes, as a matter of necessity, no less than of fact, the uncircumcised heathen whom they were commanded to destroy, were an unclean, impure and abominable seed, whom it was a pious and godly work to exterminate root and branch from the earth. And the command which God gave them to do so must be understood as accommodated to their low moral condition, yet as high as they were capable of receiving in consistency with the paramount necessity of keeping them separate from the heathen.

In the fourth place, this same principle must be applied to the maledictory psalms, which, together with other similar portions of the Old Testament, constitute one of its greatest moral difficulties. We subjoin a few examples taken almost at random from innumerable passages of similar import: "Let them be confounded and consumed together that are adversaries to my soul; let them be covered with reproach and dishonor that seek my hurt

... Pour out thine indignation upon them, and let thy wrathful anger take hold upon them ... Let their eyes be darkened that they see not, and make their loins continually to shake ... Let their table become a snare before them, and their prosperity a trap ... Let their habitation be desolate, and let none dwell in their tents .... Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous .... Let Satan stand at his right hand ... Let his prayer become sin ... Let his children be fatherless and his wife a widow; let his children be continually vagabonds and beg ... Let there be none to favor his fatherless children ... Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones."

Now, it does not seem strange that good men should often be troubled to know how to deal with such fearful maledictions. For the author well remembers that, when he was a student at Princeton College, the venerable Doctor Ashbel Greene—who had previously been president of the institution, and whose rigorous orthodoxy was his most distinguishing trait—whilst on a commencement visit to the College, having read at evening prayers one of these maledictory psalms, suddenly paused, and exclaimed: "Young gentlemen, what shall we do with all this cursing? I will tell you: 'The times of this ignorance God winked at'—and that is all that can be said about it." This, however, is by no means all that can be said about it, nor even this, without severe qualification; but such frank recognition of the greatness of the difficulty, and this wild dash at the solution of it, by such a man, could never be forgotten.

Concerning these maledictions, it may be properly said, as it has been by others, that, in many of them, the original Hebrew expresses no sentiments which are not in perfect accord with New Testament light. For instead of being prayers or wishes, they are often but simple declarations or predictions of the judgments which must come upon the wicked under the providence and government of a just

God; and such declarations are as full and emphatic in the New Testament as they are in the Old. In many cases, also, if we examine them attentively, we shall find that they are the expressions of love and pity, rather than of hatred. For even where the Psalmist prays that his enemies may be confounded and brought to shame, he often gives us to understand that the burden of his prayer is, that their enmity against God and His people may be frustrated, and not that their persons or souls should be destroyed. In fact, some of his keenest maledictions he follows with prayers for their conversion, as in the following case: "O my God, make them as stubble before the wind: as a fire burneth a wood, and as a flame setteth the mountains on fire, so persecute them with thy tempest, and make them afraid with thy storm: fill their faces with shame—that they may seek thy name, O Lord." Now, if these last words had not been added, we must have understood all the rest as an unqualified curse on the prophet's enemies; but from them we see that it is really a prayer for their salvation—that God would bring them to the saving knowledge of himself, though by such inflictions as we, with our gospel light, are not allowed to invoke upon our own, nor even upon the enemies of God. In other cases, however, these explanations do not apply; but we find sentiments expressed which require us to bear in mind that, in consequence of the necessary veiling of truth from the people of that day, they did not, and could not know God in his whole character, nor in his relations to all His moral creatures, as we know him—sentiments which must be interpreted by the principle that their revelations had to be accommodated to the degree of moral and spiritual light which they were capable of receiving.

We shall find, also, that still further light will be thrown upon the general subject under discussion, and upon this particular difficulty, if we take into consideration here the mediation of the prophets, through which, in great part,

this accommodation appears to have been effected. For, except in the proclamation of the ten commandments from the summit of Mount Sinai, God never spoke immediately to the people themselves. It seems that they could not bear to receive communications from Him without human mediation; and, perhaps, there would have been a certain impropriety or incongruity in any declaration, or commandment, or ordinance from the very mouth of God which had not in itself an immutable, eternal obligation, but was destined at some future time to be abolished. However this may be, when the people heard that mysterious "voice of words," as "the voice of a trumpet exceeding loud," which "sounded long, and waxed louder and louder," proceeding out of the cloud and flame on the summit of Mount Sinai, naturally they were overwhelmed with terror, and fled from the awful presence: "For they could not endure that which was commanded:" in other words, their spiritual state was such that they could not receive revelations immediately from God, nor such as were becoming and proper for the mouth of the Eternal to deliver. Hence they said to Moses: "Go thou near and hear all that the Lord our God shall say, and speak thou with us all that the Lord our God shall speak unto thee... and we will hear it and do it... but let not God speak with us lest we die." And this request God himself recognized as altogether a reasonable one, for he said to Moses: "I have heard the voice of the words of this people which they have spoken unto thee: they have well said that which they have spoken." Accordingly, it was on this occasion that He established Moses in the office of a mediator between himself and them for the delivery of his oracles, saying: "But as for thee, stand thou here by me, and I will speak unto thee all the commandments, the statutes, and the judgments which thou shalt teach them, that they may do them." At the same time, He gave them a solemn assurance that He would keep them supplied in the future

with a succession of prophets like unto Moses to act as mediators between himself and them; for this is the significance of that famous prediction which included the Messiah himself as the crowning term of the series: "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I command him." Nor is there anything more wonderful in their whole history, which is filled with signs and wonders, than the actual fulfilment of this sublime prophecy, through so many centuries, from Moses to the advent in the flesh of the Lord of glory.

Now these prophets, possibly with some exceptions as in the case of Balaam, were doubtless the most pure and exalted and heroic souls of the times in which they lived. But all of them, except the great Prophet by whom the series was crowned, were men of like passions with other men; their sentiments, whilst they delivered the word of the Lord unto the people to whom they ministered, could not always have been those of perfectly sanctified hearts; and hence their messages could not fail to be more or less affected and colored by the human drapery in which they had to be clothed. In order to see what the effect of this must needs have been, let us endeavor to comprehend the circumstances and influences under which the prophets spoke. Let us ascend in imagination the stream of time, and the development of moral and spiritual light in the world, for something like three thousand years, until we can take our stand where David stood, and look forth out of his eyes upon all things as they must have appeared to him. Here, now, we behold the church as consisting of one small people, surrounded by great and mighty heathen nations, who all stand ready to devour her. The people of God and the people of Israel are one and the same. The enemies of God and the enemies of the holy nation are hardly distinguishable. The wars of Israel with the neighboring heathen nations are life-and-death struggles of the

truth and the cause of God with the principalities and powers of evil in the world. This deadly conflict between truth and error, good and evil, is destined hereafter to take on a more inward and spiritual form, but now, at this early stage of its development, it is waged in an outward manner, and with carnal weapons: "For that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual." In these circumstances, in order that the people of God may not be discouraged, but may be animated and strengthened to fight manfully the good fight of faith, it is revealed to them, through the mediation of their God-ordained prophets, that their enemies shall never be allowed permanently to triumph over them, but that the church and the truth shall assuredly come off conquerors in the end. To this Divinely communicated assurance the prophets give utterance mostly in their own words, in their own figures of speech, undeniably in their own various forms of expression and style, but chiefly, as is natural and inevitable, in reiterated and tremendously emphasized predictions of calamity, disaster, defeat, overthrow, and utter destruction to the enemies of God, of His truth, and of His people. Such predictions naturally and inevitably take the form of maledictions. How otherwise can they be sufficiently emphasized to assure the hearts of God's people, who are as sheep and lambs in the midst of ravening wolves?

Hence these maledictions are to be understood as the revelations of God's judgments upon men and nations regarded as the incorrigible enemies of His church, His truth, and His salvation. And if, at times, the human sentiments of the prophets, or even their resentments of national and personal wrongs and outrages, did color their forms of expression in delivering to the people God's assurances of the overthrow of His and their enemies, what is this but that they were men of like passions with those to whom they ministered? Was it not for this very like-

ness that they were chosen of God to be the organs of communication between Him and their brethren, because He saw that He could reach their minds more effectually in this way than He could without such mediators? What though, whilst they waited for the fulness of evangelical light, and in the flame of their unrivaled patriotism, they felt, and sometimes gave expression to a joy which was too near akin to that of revenge over the assured downfall of their proud and cruel oppressors, by whom their native land was ravaged, their sacred city and their holy temple were plundered and burned with fire, and they themselves, with their wives and children, were transported to penal settlements among the heathen—what does it all amount to but that they had "this treasure" of God's eternal purpose to defend His church and people, and to punish His and their incorrigible enemies, "in earthen vessels"? This, surely, ought not to weaken our faith in their deliverances as being, in their substance and true meaning, the very word of the living God.

In the fifth place, there is still another of these moral difficulties which arises from the custom which prevailed among the Israelites, and, indeed, among all other nations of their times, to include the innocent children and families of criminals in the punishments of their parents. Thus, by the command of Joshua, "the sons and daughters" of Achan were put to death for their father's sin. Jehu, also, in fulfilment of the prophecies of Elijah and Elisha, slew all the family and kindred of Ahab, "until he left him none remaining." His sons, to the number of "seventy persons," were thus beheaded at one time, and their heads were carried in baskets, and deposited "in two heaps" at the gate of the city of Jezreel. In like manner, David in a time of famine inquired of the Lord for what it had been sent, and "the Lord answered, It is for Saul, and for his bloody house, because he slew the Gibeonites," that is, in violation of the sworn league which Joshua had made with

them. Then, by way of atonement for this crime, and upon a demand made by the surviving Gibeonites, David took the two sons of Saul by Rizpah his concubine, and five of his grandsons by "Michal" his daughter (although Michal in the text is perhaps a clerical error for Merab) and delivered them over to the Gibeonites, who straightway "hanged them up [crucified them] unto the Lord in Gibeah of Saul." And, here, by the way, we have an incident of overwhelming pathos, which has been made the subject of a great realistic painting. "For Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah, took sackcloth and spread it for her upon the rock from the beginning of harvest until water dropped upon them from heaven, and suffered not the birds of the air to rest upon them by day, nor the beasts of the field by night." Had not this poor mother some rights in her children? Would Christ have commanded that these seven innocent persons should be thus judicially done to death in expiation of a crime which had been committed by their father or grandfather, and probably before some of them were born?

We have no hesitation in answering, that Christ would have given no such command; neither does the record claim for this execution the sanction of Divine authority. For the oracle which ascribed the famine to the guilt of Saul and his bloody house does not even suggest any such atonement. There is nothing to indicate that either David or the Gibeonites acted by Divine direction in this dark and bloody transaction. For aught that appears, it was a judicial murder: and this view of it is confirmed by the fact, that all such punishment had been expressly prohibited by Moses: "The fathers shall not be put to death for their children, neither shall the children be put to death for their fathers—every man shall be put to death for his own sin." But this law was at least two thousand years in advance of public opinion—it could not be executed until the gospel had revolutionized the world—it was

powerless in the face of the universal custom of the times. Precisely the same view is to be taken of the execution of Achan's children. Nor is the case of Jehu different, although it is somewhat complicated by the prophecies which had gone before concerning the destruction of the house of Ahab. For these prophecies can in no wise be held to justify the agency of those by whom, in the pursuit of their own selfish ends, they were fulfilled—least of all, that shocking spectacle of human heads which was exhibited at the gate of Jezreel. That Christ should be crucified was much more a matter of prophecy, but that did not justify those who crucified Him. All such cases are properly interpreted by the words of St. Peter concerning the Lord's death: "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Accordingly, Jehu, notwithstanding his professed zeal for the Lord, was an idolator in heart and practice, and evidently had no other object in cutting off the house of Ahab than to secure his own possession of the throne. At the same time, the judicial purposes of God concerning that house, as these had been revealed by His prophets, were fulfilled, and that great law of His providence which is expressed in the words, "I the Lord thy God am a jealous God visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me," was carried into effect. For this law, which runs through all times and dispensations, simply represents a fact of the Divine providence, that children are partakers of the evil as well as the good of their parents—a fact which is patent to all men, which is a necessary consequence of the organic unity of the family, and against which all objections are as vain and foolish as any that can be urged against any other fact in the constitution of the moral or physical universe.

It remains, now, to consider after what manner the Lord himself recognizes and applies to such moral difficulties of

the Old Testament as these the principle by which, in most of the preceding cases, we have attempted to solve them. For, in His sermon on the mount and elsewhere, He refers to a number of the enactments or allowances of the Mosaic law, and either completes or corrects them as He judged that they required. It is true, indeed, that His criticisms and corrections have commonly been explained as applying, not to the law itself, but to misunderstandings or perversions of it by its Jewish interpreters; but such explanations cannot be maintained without resorting both to misinterpretation and to mistranslation. For the words ἐῤῥέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, which in our English version are translated sometimes "it was," and sometimes, "it hath been—said by them of old time," ought to have been uniformly rendered, as is now generally acknowledged, "it was said to them of old time." There is no reason whatever for the variation from "it was" to "it hath been:" and, with respect to the rendering, "it was said by," instead of "to them of old time," it is true that the Greek in itself will bear either sense, but that the former cannot be admitted here is proved by the fact, that, in four out of the six cases introduced, the statements of what was said are made in precise quotations from the law as delivered either by God himself in the decalogue, or by Moses in His name, and in the other two cases perfectly fair and unimpeachable abstracts or summaries are given. Hence this rendering, "it was said by,"—requires that God and Moses, whose precise words are quoted, should be meant by "them of old time." Now, if Moses could, surely God could not, be fitly or reverently designated by any such expression. Moreover, if the Lord had intended to correct misinterpretations or perversions of the law, no reason can be assigned for his exact quotations of its words. We shall see hereafter how totally inapplicable this view is to one case, at least, where He expressly prohibits what He himself admits and declares that Moses had allowed. And, with

respect to the words which, though correctly translated, have been misinterpreted in support of this view, that the Lord did not mean to correct the law itself, they are the following: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil: for verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." But this declaration is in no wise inconsistent with what is here maintained. For it was evidently intended to guard against that entire misunderstanding of His relation to the law which otherwise would have been natural, and perhaps unavoidable, from his subsequent treatment of its claims; but it cannot reasonably be understood as affirming the final completeness or absolute perfection of the law in the forms in which it had been delivered "to them of old time," nor absolutely that it should never pass away. For He himself here states a certain condition upon which very much might, as it subsequently did, pass from the law, namely, that it should be fulfilled. Now this fulfilment to which He refers is His work, not ours, and, consequently, what He says here has no bearing upon the question, whether the law in its requirements of us was such that it could never have anything added to or taken from it. In consequence of His fulfilment of the ritual law, it ceased to be of any moral obligation, and did utterly pass away; and in consequence of His fulfilment of the moral law, it has ceased to be a condition of the believer's acceptance with God, and its penal claims no longer stand against him. But if these words of the Lord, "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled," are not inconsistent with these two great modifications of it, still less are they inconsistent with His giving to it, regarded as the rule of life, its final and perfect form, wherever it had been provisionally enacted, or incompletely made known, in accommodation "to them of old time."

We proceed now to exhibit in order these six cases

wherein our Divine Teacher completes, by correcting or extending the provisions of the moral law as delivered to the people of the old dispensation. In two of these, He quotes from the decalogue itself, and develops its spiritual import, both with respect to the extent of its obligation, and to the punishment of its violation.

In the first case, He quotes the precise words of the sixth commandment, and subjoins a reference to the judgment of God incurred by its transgressors—in which reference, he unquestionably gives a true summary and interpretation of the general import of this enactment—then He adds what He judged necessary to complete it: "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill, and, whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment. But I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say unto his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; and whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell-fire." Is it not self-evident that He is treating here of the commandment itself, as not expressing the whole truth? For the condemnation of an outward act does not necessarily express, though it may imply condemnation of the feeling or state of mind from which it springs; and certainly the prohibition of murder does not logically contain the prohibition of opprobrious or injurious words. Consequently, He proceeds here to complete this commandment by unfolding the spirituality of its obligation as comprehending the feeling of anger without just cause, by extending it to injurious and reviling words, and by adding to it what it does not even intimate, and what cannot fairly be inferred from anything in the whole law of Moses, namely, that the punishment of its violation includes the future torments of hell: in all which, it seems plain enough that He is dealing with the commandment itself, rather than with any perverse misunderstanding of it.

In the second case, He quotes the seventh commandment, in His treatment of which He evidently refers to the impure relations between the sexes which were tolerated under the old dispensation because the people of those times were incapable of anything better. For, in the laws of Moses, no restriction appears to have been laid upon polygamy or concubinage—they seem to have been regarded without censure or reproof. Except that kings were forbidden 'to multiply wives and horses to themselves,' we find nothing in those laws to restrain any man from having as many wives and concubines as he chose. Moses legislates upon, without prohibiting them, both these forms of impurity, which implies that he tolerated them. In fact, they appeared in the very source of Hebrew life, and were authorized by the noblest patriarchal examples. For Abraham himself, although he restricted himself to one wife at a time, certainly had one concubine, Hagar, and from the following notice he seems to have had more: "Unto the sons of the concubines which Abraham had Abraham gave gifts, and sent them away from his son Isaac while he yet lived." Jacob, also, the father of the twelve patriarchs, by whose God-given name of Israel his descendants always delighted to distinguish themselves, was both a polygamist and a concubinist, and, if he had not been, there would have sprung from him but six tribes at most, instead of the sacred number, twelve. Now, these impure sexual relations in the very fountain of their ethnic life, and these high examples, could not fail to influence powerfully the subsequent morality of the people. What restrictions upon these national customs they could have been induced to accept may readily be inferred. And it is in the light of such facts as these that we are able to comprehend the populous harem of King David, and the one thousand wives and concubines of Solomon.

Now, with all this in view, together with much more, some of which will require to be exhibited in the next case,

our Lord here declares that, in the superior light which He brought into the world, such impure relations between the sexes could be no longer tolerated. He says nothing, indeed, about polygamy or concubinage, but He strikes directly at the impurity of heart from which they spring, and which the seventh commandment, in the form in which it had been originally delivered, did not explicitly condemn: "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery. But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. And if thy right eye offend thee [in this way] pluck it out and cast it from thee, for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell." Here He places the stigma of Divine reprobation upon the bosom sin from which all impure acts proceed; also, upon its primary form of expression by the eye; and, as in the preceding case, He adds to the commandment what it did not, in its original form, even suggest, namely, that its violation incurs the punishment of hell.

Such is our Lord's treatment of the decalogue, in order that it might be made fully to express what the perfect law of moral duty requires, together with the spiritual penalty of its violation. Its previous insufficiency, which he so strongly emphasizes, is to be explained solely by the fact, to which He here evidently refers, and which He subsequently brings forward, that the people of the former dispensation were, by reason of the hardness of their hearts, incapable of receiving it in any more searching or spiritual form. And we shall immediately see that He treats with still greater freedom and boldness other enactments and allowances of the Mosaic laws, which had been so far accommodated to the moral susceptibilities and capacities of the people that they now required to be abrogated altogether.

Accordingly, in the third, and perhaps the most significant of all these cases, our Lord, by his own Divine authority, abrogates that freedom of divorce which had been previously allowed. For we find nothing in Moses' laws to restrain any man from putting away his wife or wives at his own pleasure, nor from marrying other women, nor women, so divorced, from marrying other men. On the contrary, all these customs were regulated by legal enactments, and thus expressly allowed, as in the following words: "When a man hath taken a wife and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her [of which he alone was the judge] then, let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it into her hand, and send her out of his house; and, when she is departed, she may go and be another man's wife." And, from the manner in which such divorces are referred to by the prophets, as, also, from our knowledge of human nature, we may be sure that they became very common, and an evil of enormous magnitude.

One reason for their toleration, however, may have been that it enabled the prophets, from time to time, to purify the people, after they had corrupted themselves by intermarriage with heathen women. This, at least, was the most important use that ever seems to have been made of it. For, notwithstanding the stringent prohibitions of such marriages in the law, the charms of "the daughters of men," as before the flood, often proved irresistible to the frail "sons of God." These prohibitions were a feeble obstacle to the tide of previous customs both with the people and their princes. For the twelve sons of Jacob, the heads of the tribes of Israel, must have married alien wives. Joseph, we know, was the husband of an Egyptian woman, who was the mother of Ephraim and Manasseh, the former of whom was the progenitor of a tribe which became so numerous and powerful that, in the subsequent history, it was the great rival of the tribe of Judah. Judah

himself, as we are informed, had at least one Canaanitish wife, and his son Phares, from whom descended the royal and sacred line of David, was the offspring of his involuntary connection with his own daughter-in-law, who also was probably a Canaanitess. Further on in the history, we find Salmon, a prince of the house of Judah, married to Rahab, a Canaanitish harlot, who was the mother of Boaz, the husband of Ruth, a Moabitess. All these, from Judah down, were the ancestors of David, and of our Lord himself. David, also, had alien women among his numerous wives, one of whom was the mother of Absalom; and Solomon had many such, among whom an Ammonitess was the mother of Rehoboam, his successor on the throne; whilst his marriage with the daughter of Pharaoh was, it seems, the occasion on which he composed "the Song of Songs." No wonder, then, that the captives who returned from Babylon, influenced by such high examples, immediately began to corrupt themselves by intermarrying with, and "doing according to the abominations of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians and the Amorites." And it was on this occasion that the prophet Ezra took advantage of the freedom of divorce which Moses allowed to purify 'the holy seed' by compelling upwards of one hundred heads of families to put away their heathen wives.

But the all-controlling reason why this freedom was tolerated must have been that which the Lord himself assigns in the following passage, where he abrogates it in the most unequivocal manner: "It was said, Whosoever will put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement. But I say unto you, whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is [so] divorced, committeth adultery." And when the Pharisees objected to this doctrine on the ground that Moses had authorized them thus to repudiate their wives, He ad-

mits the fact, as undeniable, and gives, as the reason why he did so, the hardness of their hearts, which rendered them incapable of receiving any better rules of moral duty: "The Pharisees also came unto Him tempting Him, and saying unto Him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And He answered and said unto them, Have ye not read that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore, they are no more twain, but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together let not man put asunder. They say unto Him, Why did Moses, then, command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is [so] put away doth commit adultery." Thus He reiterates His own prohibition of what Moses had allowed, on the ground that it was an accommodation to their low moral state, and was not in accordance with the eternal laws of morality—"from the beginning it was not so"—and re-affirms on His own authority that, if they should continue to practice it, they would incur the guilt of adultery.

Here, now, we have the typical case which clearly interprets all the others, and demonstrates that they were not directed against misunderstandings or perversions of the law, but were intended to qualify or complete it where it was deficient, or even to abrogate those things in it which had been most accommodated to the low moral and spiritual susceptibilities of the people, and to replace them with final revelations of the perfect moral law. Thus we have established, on the authority of the Lord himself, the principle

which we have applied to the solution of these moral difficulties of the Old Testament. And what, we may well ask, can we possibly gain—do we not stultify ourselves—by denying that He sets His own teachings in opposition to things which Moses allowed, when He himself unequivocally admits the fact, and fairly shoulders the whole difficulty?

Hence, in the fourth case, He must, in reason, be understood in a similar manner. For here he refers to a rule of morality many times reiterated by Moses in such words as the following: Ye shall not swear by my name falsely. . . . If a man swear. . . an oath to bind his soul with a bond, he shall not break his word, but shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth." And, precisely as in the last case, He absolutely prohibits what Moses allowed: "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time: Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths. But I say unto you, swear not at all; neither by heaven, for it is God's throne; nor by the earth, for it is His footstool; neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King; neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea, Nay, nay, for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." Our present purpose does not require us to touch the vexed question, whether this is to be understood of judicial, as well as of other oaths, but simply to show that the Lord here prohibits what Moses, by way of accommodation, had allowed and sanctioned.

In the fifth case, He refers to the *lex talionis*, as given by Moses, quoting his very words, which law, whether so intended or not, the people were left free to understand as equally applicable to private and public wrongs. For, in the whole law, there is no intimation that it was to be limited to the administration of public justice; and that it was not so understood at the time is evident from the Mosaic

provisions concerning "the avenger of blood" and "the cities of refuge." Now, to all this the Lord opposes what previously was altogether unknown, namely, His own doctrine of non-resistance to evil: "Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also; and if a man shall sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also; and whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain." Again, we need not inquire, whether all this is to be interpreted literally, or by the common figure of hyperbole.

In the sixth and last case, He lays down the New Testament law of love to our enemies, with a precisely similar reference to what Moses had allowed: "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy." Now, it seems evident that the preceding cases, especially the third, in which undeniably He revokes what had been previously sanctioned, ought, if other evidence were wanting, to govern the interpretation of this one. For although it is not said in the law, Thou shalt hate thine enemy, yet surely it cannot be regarded as a strained or unfair summary of such passages as the following: "Remember what Amalek did unto thee in the way when ye came forth out of Egypt—how he met thee by the way, and smote the hindmost of thee—all the feeble ones behind thee, when thou wast faint and weary. Therefore, it shall be, when the Lord thy God hath given thee rest from all thine enemies round about in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance to possess it, that thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven—thou shalt not forget it.... An Ammonite or a Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord, even to the tenth generation ... forever, because they met you not with bread and water by the way when ye came forth out of Egypt, and be-

cause they hired against thee Balaam the son of Beor . . . to curse thee. . . . Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their good all thy days forever." All this, no doubt, was indispensable to secure that rigorous sequestration of the covenant people from the influence of the surrounding heathen, without which, as we have seen, the great object for which they had been called out of the world could not be accomplished. But is it in accordance with New Testament light, that they should be thus enjoined to cherish, from generation to generation and forever, the memory of the injuries which they had suffered from these neighboring and kindred tribes? Is not the appeal here made to this motive, in order to secure the result, as palpable an accommodation to their low moral and spiritual condition, which rendered them insusceptible to higher and purer motives, as was that freedom of divorce which Moses allowed, and which the Lord abrogated? Hence He proceeded to deal with it precisely as he had dealt with that: "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy, But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you: that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven, for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth His rain on the just and on the unjust."

In conclusion, the practical consequences of the views which have now been presented are very numerous and far-reaching, but they cannot be developed here. We can only add, that no objection to the method we have employed in dealing with the moral difficulties of the Old Testament can have any force or validity which does not offer a more satisfactory solution of them, and which does not invalidate the evidence here given that this was the method adopted and applied by the Lord himself. Failing this, we may safely rest in the conviction, that the

moral light of the Old Testament is vastly inferior to that of the New, and that whatever there may be in the former which is not in perfect harmony with the latter, is to be explained by the unripeness of times, and, as a rule of moral duty for us, is to be corrected, as Christ sets us the example of correcting it, by the superior light of His own spoken word and gospel.

XVII

THE PARAMOUNT CHARACTER OF THE LORD'S TEACHING

Never man spake like this Man. . . . That in all things He might have the pre-eminence.

In the preceding study, we have considered the controlling and modifying influence of our Lord's teaching upon the revelations of the Old Testament, and we must now inquire, whether it bears a similar relation to the subsequent writings of His apostles, especially to those of St. Paul, which have so largely contributed to mould theology and Christian faith. The necessity of this inquiry arises from the fact, which is evident even to a cursory reader of the New Testament, that there are remarkable differences between our Lord Jesus Christ and His holy apostle Paul, with respect to the verbal and intellectual forms in which they set forth the same truths. These differences, of course, are regarded by all Christians, not as involving anything of the nature of inconsistency, but as pertaining merely to forms of presentation. Yet the more they are contemplated, the more striking they become. We propose, therefore, to examine them with some attention, in order to elicit their meaning, if any they have which may help us to a better understanding of revealed truth.

The general characteristics of our Lord's teaching to which we refer are such as the following: He reveals the truths of the spiritual world on His own authority, as intuitively perceived by himself, with the least possible resort to logical processes, in synthetic or concrete forms, and in

highly figurative language. He seldom refers to the preceding Scriptures, and then, as it would seem, quite as much for the purpose of confirming their truth as that of His own declarations. He does not hesitate, as we have seen, to supersede, upon occasion, their deliverances by new revelations, as in the typical case of the Mosaic laws of marriage and divorce: "For He taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes." He seems carefully to avoid abstractions and definitions. The figures and symbols of great variety and boldness which abound in His discourses He seldom interprets, and then, evidently, without aiming at exactness or precision. He never explains how far His similitudes are to be carried. The profound and sublime truths which He throws out with almost every breath He leaves without precise boundaries and necessary qualifications to work, as vital principles, their own effects and consequences in human life; of which we have examples in the parables of the unjust steward, the unjust judge, the friend of whom one came to borrow bread at midnight, and in a multitude of such declarations as the following: "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Evidently He feels no solicitude or concern for the systematic harmony of the truths which He delivers, although these are often so remote and different from each other that they have the appearance of being inconsistent, or contradictory, as in the following examples: "I and my Father are one... My Father is greater than I... There is none good but one, that is God... Which of you convinceth me of sin. ... Ye will not come to me that ye might have life.... No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him... All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth... To sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give... No man hath ascended up to heaven but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven." Hence these and similar antinomies

in His teaching have proved the fruitful germs of vast and hostile systems of theology. So rigorously does He abstain from all attempts at systematization that even such words as regeneration, justification and sanctification, together with their derivative forms, He hardly ever uses, and never, as it would seem, to express those theological and systematic abstractions which they commonly represent in the writings of St. Paul. In His mouth they have a free and popular sense, as in the following cases: "By thy words thou shalt be justified... I sanctify myself... Ye which have followed me in the regeneration." Moreover, in the place of justification by faith, as this form of doctrine is exhibited and emphasized by St. Paul, He everywhere insists upon the forgiveness of sins, and the more comprehensive form of salvation by faith: "Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven.... He that believeth on me hath everlasting life... If ye believe not that I am He, ye shall die in your sins:" in all which, how true it is that "never man spake like this Man"! In fine, He rather assumes by implication than enunciates the doctrines of the Divine decrees, foreordination and election, which, in the writings of St. Paul, are carefully stated, copiously developed, variously illustrated and applied.

In all these and many other particulars of form, the teaching of the Master is strikingly different from that of His great apostle. For St. Paul constantly appeals to the preceding Scriptures, and to Christ himself, as the ultimate authority, not only for his readers, but also for his own mind. He delivers the truth in abstract rather than in concrete forms. Figurative or symbolical language he seems to avoid as much as possible. He interprets and applies the types and allegories of the Old Testament, but introduces none of his own, nor has he a single parable. He is eminently argumentative, logical, systematic. He delights in abstruse processes of reasoning, and canvasses with great earnestness and rigor the objections which arise

against his doctrines. In these arguments he marshalls his ideas in dense masses—their movements are like the thunderous tramp of armed squadrons—he storms the enemies' camp. Also, he strongly insists upon the systematic harmony of the whole scheme of revealed truth, not only with itself, but also with the providential history of the people of God from Abraham down to his own time; and he takes special pains to reconcile the legal dispensation under Moses with salvation by grace and faith, as revealed in germ to Abraham, wrought out efficaciously by the Lord Jesus, and doctrinally elaborated by himself. Above all, he lays the greatest stress upon the Divine decrees, predestination, election and justification by faith alone; which last he evidently regards as the most important form of truth for the special object which he aims to accomplish, since it is the theme of his most labored epistles, and the substratum of all his writings.

Such, in general, without taking into account the particular qualifications which these statements may require, are the most obvious differences in form between the teaching of Christ and that of St. Paul, as represented in the reported discourses of the one, and in the extant writings of the other. How are we to understand them? What help do they afford us for a better appreciation of revealed truth? These are the questions which we have now to consider.

It is hardly necessary to observe, however, that the absolute authority claimed by our Lord Jesus Christ is sufficiently accounted for by the orthodox conception of His divinity; whilst St. Paul, as His disciple and apostle, could not do otherwise than recognize the authority of his Master and of the Scriptures whose inspiration was so fully indorsed by Him. Perhaps, also, some of these differences may be explained by the peculiarities of St. Paul's mental constitution and education, which, as in the case of the other sacred writers, his plenary inspiration certainly did not

obliterate. But, with respect to most of those which have been indicated, they cannot be disposed of in this summary way, but must be regarded as having a deeper significance. Accordingly, some sceptical authors maintain that they are not mere differences of form, but of essential doctrine, and that, in the history of the church, the doctrinal system of the disciple has prevailed over, and thrown into the shade, the unsystematic teaching of the Master. Hence what has been called Christianity they call Paulinism. We may find hereafter that this chaff is not without its grain of truth. Others, who cannot be classed with sceptics, would account for these differences by regarding Christ as the originator of Christianity, and St. Paul as its first great philosophical or doctrinal expounder. Among Christians, however, the most common explanation seems to be, that there is a certain progress of revelation in the New Testament, such that what the Lord delivers in germ or principle, St. Paul develops, formulates and systematizes. In confirmation of this view, which differs but little from the preceding, the writings of the apostle are analyzed, and the following declarations of the Lord are cited: "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now: howbeit, when He the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth ... He will show you things to come." It is claimed that these and similar declarations contain a promise of a more full and complete revelation than was given by the Lord himself, which, accordingly, we are supposed to have in the subsequent writings of His apostles.

Now, we are constrained to reject all these explanations; the first, as sceptical and false, having but a single sparkle of truth to render it plausible; the second, as savoring of rationalism, and, together with the third, as inadequate to account for the facts, and as otherwise objectionable. For they supply us with no good reason why those particular doctrines, rather than others, to which Christ only alludes should have been so treated by Him, nor why the same

doctrines should have been so strenuously insisted on by St. Paul. Justification by faith can hardly be conceived of as one of those things which the disciples could not receive from the lips of their Divine Master, since all the difficulties which it involves are quite as palpable in the doctrine of salvation by faith, upon which He everywhere insists. Nor is there anything hard to be received in St. Paul's treatment of the decrees, foreordination and election which is not contained in the teaching of Christ, wherever He assumes or alludes to these mysterious doctrines. Still less satisfactory, if possible, are these views as an explanation of the Lord's unsystematic and figurative presentation of the truth, and of those startling antinomies with which it abounds; for in these we find much greater difficulties than any which St. Paul has left us to deal with in his systematic and harmonized scheme of doctrine. But the strongest objection to such progress of revelation as is here supposed is, that it represents the highest, in fact, the only absolute and final forms of the truth, as delivered to us, not in the words of the Master himself, but in those of His disciples. Now this, which might be accepted in the case of a merely human teacher—Socrates, Plato, Aristotle or Kant, for example—is totally inadmissible in that of the incarnate Word and Wisdom of God, to whom, in teaching, as in everything else, pre-eminence ought to be ascribed. Moreover, this dependence upon the disciples for the last word of revelation does not seem to be altogether consistent with that personal trust in Christ himself for salvation from error, as well as from all the other evils of sin, by which we become partakers of His fulness, and in which none of His disciples, howsoever plenarily inspired, can stand in His place. Nor do His words, which are cited above in proof of such progress require to be so interpreted. For evidently the principal truth which they were intended to declare is, that the Holy Spirit should open the minds of the disciples to a more full understand-

ing and realization of the revelations which the Lord had delivered, and which they had but very imperfectly comprehended. The declaration, "He shall . . . bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you," may fairly be taken as explanatory of whatever stands in the same connection. Besides, the interpretation of those promises concerning the Paraclete in the sense of a progressive revelation requires that they should be rigorously limited to the apostles, for, otherwise, they give assurance of inspiration, as the source of revelation, to the whole church in all subsequent ages; and such limitation is inconsistent with the account of their fulfilment on the day of Pentecost, and with the gift of the Spirit as enjoyed by all Christians. Consequently, that interpretation which requires that they should be so limited cannot be maintained. We shall see hereafter that this notion of a progressive revelation, subsequent to that given us by the Lord, has exerted a disastrous influence upon theology, and upon the whole life of the church, such, indeed, as to render colorable the charge of her enemies, that her actual faith is Paulinism rather than Christianity.

Now all these and similar errors upon this subject seem to be closely connected with false or inadequate views of the nature of revealed truth, especially with respect to its higher and lower, its more or less symbolical forms, in which, for different purposes, it is capable of being, and often requires to be expressed. But their principal source is the failure to discriminate the precise object of Christ's teaching from that which St. Paul had in view, especially in his labored discussions with his countrymen. For commonly it has been assumed that these objects were one and the same, not only in their general character, but even in their more special aspects, in which it devolves upon us to show that they were very different. Hence, in order to refute these errors, and to disclose what seems to be the true significance of these differences, we shall endeavor to evince

two things: First, that the object of St. Paul's principal writings was of a subordinate and limited nature, suitably to his position and character as the disciple of a Master, namely, to present the truths of the gospel in forms specially adapted to meet Jewish difficulties and to convince the Jewish mind: and, secondly, that the object of the Lord's teaching was of a paramount nature, in accordance with the pre-eminence of His person and character, namely, to reveal the truths of the spiritual world in their highest and most adequate forms for the satisfaction of the spiritual wants of all mankind.

We proceed, then, to consider the evidence that the apostle had the above special object in view, and that to this fact the differential characteristics of his mode of presenting the truth are chiefly due.

But here, at the outset, we encounter an objection, which immediately occurs to every one, that St. Paul was the great apostle of the gentiles, the actual founder of nearly all the first gentile churches, and that to these churches his principal writings are addressed. How, then, is it possible that his leading object should have been to commend the gospel to his countrymen? But this objection, which seems at first sight as if it might be insuperable, will be found, upon closer scrutiny, to confirm what we have undertaken to prove. For the people of the Jews, at that time, just as they are now, were dispersed abroad throughout the civilized world. It has been estimated that there were forty thousand of them in Antioch on the Orontes, two hundred and fifty thousand in Alexandria, upwards of a million in the whole of Egypt, and an unknown multitude in Rome. There was hardly a gentile city of any importance which had not its Jewish synagogue. Hence, wherever the apostle of the gentiles, in his missionary travels, was led, he found there a colony of his countrymen and co-religionists, among whom it was his custom, as it was evidently a dictate of wisdom and common sense, to commence his evangelizing labors.

For in preaching to them, he had the immense advantages of a common nationality and descent, a common acquaintance with the Hebrew language and history, and a common appeal to the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures. But, far above all these, that long course of Divine training and preparation for the advent of their promised Messiah and the gospel dispensation to which the children of Israel had been subjected under their ritual and moral laws, the ministry of their prophets, and their wonderful providential history, was now complete, and its fruit was ripe. Consequently, in so far as this Divine scheme of national education had proved a success (which, however, was only partial by reason of difficulties to be noticed hereafter) they must have been better prepared to understand and appreciate the gospel than were the gentiles who had enjoyed no such advantages. In this way, it came to pass, that the very first thing which St. Paul had to do in his work of planting churches among the gentiles, was, to adapt his teaching to meet the difficulties and win the faith of his countrymen. Hence, also, the first churches that were organized on gentile ground were chiefly composed of Jewish converts. We have abundant evidence upon this point in the fact, which will be more fully presented in the sequel, that they manifested a constant tendency or proneness to lose their hold on the distinctive truths of the gospel, and to relapse into Jewish errors. For this acknowledged fact, which stands out in the early history of the church, is not adequately accounted for on the common hypothesis of Judaizing teachers having crept in amongst them. Such teachers would never have been able to persuade converts from paganism, with all their contempt for Jewish rites, that they must be circumcised in order to be saved. Yet this was one of the errors in these churches which cost the apostle the greatest trouble to eradicate, nor did he altogether succeed. Hence, as from this point of view we should confidently anticipate, the longest and most labored of his

epistles, namely, those to the Romans, the Galatians and the Hebrews—if this last be his—consist, in whole or in great part, of arguments to refute Judaizing errors, and of such presentations of the gospel as were evidently intended, as they were eminently adapted, to meet the objections and win the faith of the Jewish mind.

We proceed now to adduce the evidence contained in these three epistles, although such evidence is by no means confined to them, that it was the leading object of St. Paul to present the truths of the gospel in forms specially adapted to the spiritual wants of those who had been trained under the Mosaic law, rather than of those upon whose modes of viewing spiritual things it had never exerted its all-moulding influence. For in this object we shall find the principal source of those peculiarities in his teaching which have been indicated, and by which it so strikingly differs from that of his Master. Nor ought we to be surprised if it should appear, in the course of the discussion, that these Pauline forms of truth, the object of which was of a limited and subordinate nature, have not that universal adaptation to the spiritual wants of mankind which has been commonly ascribed to them, and which, as we shall see, is eminently characteristic of the gospel as delivered by the Lord himself.

The epistle to the Hebrews, as we might anticipate, affords the clearest and most palpable evidence. For even on the supposition of some high authorities, that it was not written by St. Paul, it yet evinces, in the most striking manner, how fully the necessity of commending the gospel to the Jewish mind was recognised, and to what an extent Apollos, or some other inspired author, sympathized with him, and shared his labors for the accomplishment of this object. Accordingly, it is addressed to the Hebrews, in distinction from the gentiles, and is wholly occupied with arguments and exhortations specially adapted to meet their difficulties, and to settle their minds

in the faith of the gospel. With this object ever in view, the author discusses a number of subjects which were of vital importance to them, but of secondary or no interest at all for others. Among these, is the question, whether Christ was indeed the Messiah of the Old Testament Scriptures, which, evidently, was one for Jews rather than for others, because the Divine authority of these Scriptures could not be assumed in argument with the heathen, and because the form under which Christ could be most fitly offered to them was not that of the Jewish Messiah, but that of Jesus, the Saviour, who had been crucified and raised from the dead for the salvation of mankind. Hence we see that St. Paul, in his address to an Athenian audience in the hall of the Areopagus, assumed nothing from the Scriptures, but quoted a heathen poet in confirmation of his doctrine, and said nothing about the Jewish Messiah, but "preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection." Another question which is argued at length in this epistle is, whether the priesthood of Christ was superior to that of Levi; and this also was one in which none but Jews or Jewish converts could feel any direct or vital interest. For whatever might be the errors to which the rest of mankind were liable, they could never have fallen into this, that the Levitical priesthood was superior to that of Christ. They, surely, had no need of instruction on this point. What they needed was to be convinced that the mediation and sacrifices of their own heathen priests had no validity or efficacy to atone for their sins and reconcile them to God. The whole elaborate discussion in the epistle leads to the following and other similar results: That the ritual law, with its tabernacle and temple worship, its priesthood, sacrifices, feasts and other ceremonies, was not of moral or permanent obligation, but was typical and temporary in nature and design—"a shadow of good things to come;" that it had now been fulfilled and superseded by the mediation and sacrifice of Christ, which alone

had an eternal efficacy "to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness." Now, although this presentation contains what is of fundamental importance for all men—for how could it express the truth of the gospel in any form if it did not?—yet, in its immediate design and adaptation, it was directed against errors to which only Jews were liable. For the gentiles had never believed in the Mosaic ritual or sacrifices, and no obstacle to their faith in Christ could possibly arise from this source. The same view is to be taken of all the Jewish errors which are controverted in this epistle—they could present no temptation to those who had not been trained under the laws of Moses. Consequently, these labored arguments and eloquent exhortations against apostasy to Judaism can have little more than an historical and secondary interest for us at the present time. It is not here, then, that we are to look for those forms of gospel truth which are best adapted to our spiritual necessities.

The evidence in the epistle to the Galatians, unquestionably written by St. Paul, is of still greater importance and weight. For these churches of Galatia were established in the midst of a colony of Gauls or Kelts who had been settled in Asia Minor for several centuries, whose ethnic character, affinities and modes of thought were as remote as possible from those of the Hebrews, and where least of all we should have anticipated that a tendency to Jewish errors could ever have shown itself. But even these churches, as it appears, were chiefly composed of converted Jews, for in them this tendency was so strong that it threatened to subvert their faith in the very principles of the gospel. Hence this epistle, from beginning to end, is one elaborate argument against the errors of Judaism, which it represents as having "bewitched" the Galatian Christians. The leading error upon which the apostle here aims his battery is, that circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic law

were still necessary to acceptance with God; and in order to drive this obstinate delusion out of their minds, he labors to convince them that they had been emancipated once and forever from the yoke of that law by the mediation and sacrifice of Christ; that, by faith in Him alone, they were completely justified from all their offences; and he solemnly warns them that, if they continued to depend upon their ritual observances now that these were abolished, they would frustrate, in so far as they themselves were concerned, all the promises and blessings of the gospel. "O foolish Galatians," he exclaims, "who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth crucified among you? . . . Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us . . . Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again in the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you that, if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing . . . Christ has become of no effect unto you." Now it is true that errors are here represented to which human nature is everywhere liable, and there are profound gospel truths here set forth which can never lose their interest or importance; yet is it abundantly evident that, in this whole discussion, it was the apostle's direct and immediate aim to refute these errors under peculiar forms to which his countrymen alone were liable, and to exhibit these truths in special adaptation to meet their difficulties, and to establish their faith. For who but Jews could ever have fallen into the error, that circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic ritual were necessary to salvation? Consequently, we are not obliged to accept these special forms of truth as those which are best adapted to the spiritual wants of mankind at large.

We have touched lightly upon the Galatians, because, in its theme and object, it is identical with the epistle to the Romans, and many of its arguments are substantially

the same. This latter we propose to examine more particularly, as being the longest, most elaborate, and every way the most important of all the apostle's extant writings, in which, therefore, we may expect to find most prominent that special object of his teachings which has been indicated, and the fullest evidence of the influence which it exerted to mould and shape the peculiar forms in which he presents the truths of the gospel.

Let us observe, then, that, although this epistle was written by Paul in his character of the great apostle of the gentiles to a church which had been established in the centre and capital of the gentile world, yet, like that to the Galatians, it consists chiefly of arguments to refute Judaizing errors, and of such presentations of gospel truth as were evidently intended and adapted to win and establish the faith of those who had Jewish difficulties to overcome. These arguments with his countrymen he commences about the middle of the second chapter, and carries them on, with some interruptions, nearly to the close of the eleventh, so that they run through the whole epistle, except the introduction, and the exhortations and greetings with which it concludes. It is true, he sometimes turns aside from the main drift of his impassioned discourse to address and instruct the gentile converts, who must have constituted some portion at least of the church in Rome; yet what he says even in such passages is evidently intended quite as much for the edification of his own countrymen. Such, *e. g.*, are his declarations that the whole world was included with the covenant people in the promises and grand objects of the gospel, and that blindness in part had happened unto the children of the covenant, until the fulness of the gentiles should come in; for the former of these statements was adapted to humble Jewish pride, and the latter was of interest chiefly for those who stood in danger of perishing from that blindness. And throughout the epistle, his special object—the instruction and sal-

vation of his countrymen—is never lost sight of for a moment, his direct address is preferably to them; and the deepest and most tender interest which he represents himself as having ever at heart is, that they may be converted and saved. We have abundant evidence of all this in the following quotations, which might be almost indefinitely multiplied: "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and restest in the law, and makest thy boast in God, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law. . . Know ye not, brethren, for I speak to them that know the law? . . I say, then, hath God cast away His people? God forbid. . . What shall we say, then, that Abraham our father . . . hath found? . . . What advantage, then, hath the Jew? and what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way, chiefly because unto them were committed the oracles of God. . . Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. . . For I could wish myself accursed from Christ for my kinsmen according to the flesh, who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption and the glory and the covenants and the giving of the law and the service of God and the promises, whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came." Thus he proceeds through the body of the epistle, with his direct address preferably to his own countrymen, expressing his deepest interest in their welfare, making it his special object to refute their peculiar errors, and to present the truth in adaptation to their characteristic states of mind, which had resulted incidentally from their training under the law. Here, also, as in the epistle to the Galatians, the leading error against which he contends is that of reliance upon the law as the ground of acceptance with God; in opposition to which, he proves that Israel, from the imperfection of their obedience and many grievous violations of the law, which thundered its penalties against every transgression, had no claim whatever to its righteousness, but were ne-

cessarily under its condemnation, and as hopelessly lost as the gentiles themselves: "What then? Are we better than they? No, in no wise, for we have before proved both Jews and gentiles, that they are all under sin." Consequently, there rested upon the Jews, as upon all others, an overwhelming necessity to find some other way of attaining to righteousness, since that of their own obedience was forever closed against them. Here, then, as in the other epistle, it is in formal argument with his countrymen, in his efforts to reach and convince their minds, that St. Paul lays himself out to establish the doctrine of justification by faith; in other words, that of attaining to righteousness without the works of the law by faith alone in Christ—"even the righteousness which is by the faith of Jesus Christ." Accordingly, one of his most telling arguments, which, indeed, must have had overwhelming force with those to whom it was addressed, is, that Abraham himself, their great forefather and covenant head, had been justified without the works of the law, "which was four hundred and thirty years after," and before he was circumcised: "Faith was reckoned unto Abraham for righteousness . . . being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe." Hence he concludes, by necessary logical consequence, that "the deeds of the law" could not, but faith must be the condition of their acceptance and peace with God: "Ye are not under the law, but under grace. . . Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."

But, now, because this great truth of their deliverance from the claims of that law which had been ordained and promulgated by God himself with prodigious signs and wonders, was one which the Jews, after their fifteen hundred years of training under legal ordinances, must find it extremely hard to comprehend and believe, the apostle goes on to unfold and apply it at great length, and with all his unrivalled force of argument and illustration. He

labors to convince them that the law was never intended to be a condition of justification, but for an entirely different purpose. Their relation to it he compares with that of a woman to her husband, and would persuade them that, by the sacrifice of Christ, they were as completely emancipated from its claims as the woman is from the authority of her husband by his death: "For the woman which hath a husband is bound by the law of her husband so long as he liveth; but, if her husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband... Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ... Now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held."

Such, in meagre sketch, is the main drift of the apostle's argument throughout this epistle; in the course of which, however, and in answer to an objection which had been raised at an early stage, namely, that, since comparatively few Israelites could be persuaded to renounce their hope of attaining to righteousness under the law, God seemed to have cast away his covenant people—in answer to this pressing objection, St. Paul sets forth and insists upon the doctrine of election; and this was one thing which required him to give it the prominence which it holds in his teaching: "I say, then, hath God cast away his people? God forbid. ... For they are not all Israel which are of Israel... God hath not cast away his people whom He foreknew... Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for, but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded... There is a remnant according to the election of grace... For whom He did foreknow He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom He did predestinate them He also called; and whom He called them He also justified; and whom He justified them He also glorified."

Thus we see how great and all-controlling an object it

was with St. Paul to refute the errors, meet the objections, and present the truths of the gospel so as to convince the minds and win the faith of his countrymen; and how great an influence this object had in shaping his doctrinal presentations is indicated by the fact, which has been brought out, that in these arguments chiefly he develops and applies those special forms of truth by the prominence of which his teaching is so remarkably distinguished from that of Christ.

Nor can we conceive of a more effectual method to convince the Jews of the insufficiency of Judaism, and to turn their faith and hope of salvation upon Christ alone, than that which is adopted in these epistles. For the need of justification, or righteousness, was that form of spiritual want which, in the Jew, from his thirty generations of training under the law, was paramount over all others. In fact, after his sensibility to all others had been well nigh lost, this one, as is evident from the prodigious development of his Pharisaic self-righteousness, continued to press upon his soul. Consequently, he could never do without some way of attaining to righteousness. To him no offer of salvation which did not include this could ever, by any possibility, be made acceptable or credible. Hence, as soon as he came to see that his acceptance with God as righteous under the law was forever impossible, and that Abraham himself had been justified without any such righteousness, his understanding must have been opened, if by any means this were possible, to appreciate the evidence of that new and living way of attaining to righteousness which the gospel provided. Indeed, nothing remained for him but to seek it in this way, or to remain forever under the soul-destroying condemnation of sin.

But, now, it is evident, when we come to consider it, that this peculiar form in which the truth was presented by St. Paul to his countrymen, with the special object to open the way of salvation to them, although implicitly it

contains the very heart and marrow of evangelical truth, and consequently what is indispensable to the spiritual wants of all mankind, is not equally well adapted to their necessities, and could never have had the same attractions for them that it had for the Jewish mind. For they could not feel, as did the Jew, this need of being justified or accepted as righteous, because that training under the law out of which it grew had never been brought to bear upon them. In fact, it may be questioned whether this peculiar form of spiritual want is ever felt, except by those who have been educated into it, either as Jews, or under Judaizing systems of theology. For if any plain man who has not been so educated be asked now, whether he feels the need of being accepted as righteous, he will hardly understand what is meant; and if it be explained to him, probably he will answer: No, I am not conscious of any such need, for I know that I am not righteous, and what good could it do me to be taken for what I am not? But if such a man be asked: Do you feel any need of the forgiveness of your sins, and of being reconciled to God? and if he have any seriousness of mind, or feeling of spiritual want in any form, he can hardly fail to answer: I certainly do, for I know that I am a sinner, and that I have become alienated from God by my erring and worldly life. Here, then, we see that the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, although it contains implicitly a fundamental truth of the gospel, upon which, as Luther rightly discerned, the church must stand, does not present this truth in that form in which the need of it is, or can be universally felt.

The universal form of this want is that of the forgiveness of sins, of reconciliation and peace with God. This is abundantly evident from the experience of mankind, as indicated above, and it is revealed with absolute authority in the fact, that the gospel, as delivered by our Lord Jesus Christ, whilst it contains no formal statement of justifica-

tion by faith, is always, or preferably, directed and adapted to meet and satisfy this want of the forgiveness of sins. Thus, in the case of the publican who went up into the temple to pray, and who, "standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner"—this truly penitent soul does not seem to have felt any need of being accepted as righteous—certainly he expresses no such feeling. It is for mercy, the forgiveness of his sins, that he bows his head, and smites upon his breast, and cries to God: whilst it is the Pharisee, with whom he is contrasted throughout, who feels the need of being accepted as righteous, and who must convince himself that he is righteous, or he cannot live. True, it is said that this publican "went down to his house justified;" but here this word, as everywhere else in our Lord's discourses, is not to be taken in its strict Pauline sense, but only as expressing that the man obtained the mercy for which he prayed—that God accepted his prayer, and himself as being penitent—for it is interpreted in this general sense by its use in such declarations of the Lord as the following: "Wisdom is justified of her children. . . . By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." Again, in "the parable of parables," that of the prodigal son, which exhibits the Lord's own map or chart of the wandering soul's return to God, and of the manner in which it is received, there is not a word about justification or righteousness, but the wanderer returns from his swine-troughs with penitence and confession, and is welcomed to his father's house and his father's table as a forgiven and reconciled sinner, whose transgressions shall never more be remembered against him Another case is that of the penitent woman who anointed the Lord's feet with precious ointment, having washed them with her tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head.—Oh, how beautiful it is!—Of her He said, "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven, for

she loved much;" and to her, "Thy sins are forgiven." In like manner, to the paralytic let down through the roof of a house He said, "Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee," as if that were all the spiritual consolation of which the man could feel any need. And when the scribes charged Him with blasphemy for these words, He added, "For whether is easier to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, Arise and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins—then saith He to the sick of the palsy, Arise, take up thy bed, and go to thy house." In fine—for we must limit ourselves to a few examples of innumerable similar declarations—we have the same presentation in what He says of those who were judicially blinded, "that seeing they might see and not perceive, and hearing they might hear and not understand, lest at any time they might be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them."

It is thus that this universal want of the human soul, and what the gospel provides to satisfy it, are set forth by the Lord, in distinction from that peculiar presentation of both which we find in the writings of St. Paul. Nor should we be surprised at this, or other differences. For it could not reasonably be expected that the Master, with the paramount aim to meet the spiritual wants of human nature, without specific reference to that limited section of it with which He came into personal contact, should deliver the truths of the spiritual world in precisely the same forms in which they were subsequently formulated by his inspired apostle for the special and subordinate purpose of convincing and persuading his countrymen, who had been peculiarly trained for so many generations under the Mosaic law. But we must ever bear in mind that these differences are merely those of form and presentation. For it is evident on the face of the record that the forgiveness of sins, in the teaching of Christ, is not the bare remittance of legal penalties, but it includes also

complete restoration to the favor and love of God, in fact, all that St. Paul so earnestly presses on his countrymen under the form of justification and the righteousness which is by faith alone.

A similar view is to be taken of the doctrine of election, to which the apostle gives such prominence, in contrast with the fact, that it is only alluded to, though certainly implied and assumed, in the teaching of his Master. For not only did this doctrine answer the objection, that comparatively few of the covenant people actually embraced the gospel, but it was eminently adapted to disarm their opposition, and to win their faith. For it embodied a principle of the Divine government and providence which had been familiar to them throughout their whole history, and which had uniformly operated in their favor. This had been signally exemplified in the original calling of Abraham out of his country and kindred to become their national founder and covenant head. Thus, also, Ishmael had been rejected, and Isaac had been elected, so that all the covenant promises, privileges and blessings should be transmitted in the line of his posterity. In the same way, Jacob had been preferred before Esau, to whom all the patriarchal institutions and customs assigned the birthright and headship of the family: "That the purpose of God according to 'election might stand... As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." In like manner, David had been chosen out of the eight goodly sons of Jesse, though the youngest of them all, and exalted from the sheep folds to become the royal shepherd and sweet psalmist of Israel, their greatest national hero, from whose loins the Messiah himself should descend. In fine, other innumerable instances being passed over, it was in the exercise of God's electing grace that they themselves had been selected from all mankind to be His covenant and peculiar people, to whom His sacred oracles should be committed, together with the glory of the shekinah, the

temple service, and all the other privileges and blessings of their high vocation. Hence this doctrine of election, and the principle of the Divine government which it represented, must have been peculiarly dear and admirably adapted to commend the gospel in which it was embosomed to every Jewish heart. But manifestly it could have no such attraction, nor any such adaptation to win the faith or awaken the hopes of the gentiles, who had enjoyed no such training under electing grace: on the contrary, it could not fail to discourage and repel them for the reason, that, hitherto, it had always discriminated against them, had operated to their disadvantage and exclusion from the covenant privileges and blessings. Here, therefore, we have one great reason why this doctrine is brought forward into such prominence in the writings of St. Paul, and why, in the teaching of Christ, it is only alluded to, and, in comparison with other truths, is left in abeyance.

Also, the special object which the apostle had so much at heart goes far to explain his logical and systematic presentation of truth. This, indeed, may be due in part to his peculiar intellectual constitution and education, but it cannot be adequately comprehended without taking into view the necessity under which he was placed to refute, by logical processes, the objections of his countrymen, and to harmonize, in a rational manner, the vast and sweeping changes introduced by the new dispensation with all that had gone before in their wonderful providential history. For during forty generations of mankind they had been the elect people of God, to the exclusion of all other nations; and, now, they could be such no longer, but the gentiles, their eternal enemies, yea, the uncircumcised and unclean, were to stand on an equality with them before the God of Israel. For thirty generations, they had been rigorously trained under that all-moulding system of legal ordinances and ritual observances which God himself, by

Moses their great prophet, had enjoined upon them, as "an everlasting statute . . . an ordinance forever;" and, now, all this was to be swept away as with a besom. Even the moral law itself, which had been proclaimed to them by the voice of God in thunder-words from the summit of Mount Sinai—what could Saul of Tarsus mean when he talked to them about this law's having been fulfilled by another for them, and of their being delivered from its claims? Why did he not try to convince them that fire would not burn, nor water drown? It is impossible for us, at this day, to appreciate the enormous difficulties and almost insuperable obstacles which these sweeping changes must have placed in the way of the acceptance of the gospel by the children of Israel. In fact, these obstacles seem to have more than neutralized, with the great body of the nation, all the influences which their education and training under the law were intended and adapted to exert upon them by way of preparation. It was in this way, doubtless, that Israel did not obtain that which he sought, but the election obtained it, and the rest were blinded. Hence we see that a most pressing necessity rested upon St. Paul, in his labors for their salvation, to convince them that these astonishing changes were truly and properly developments of germs contained in, and consequently that they were in perfect harmony with, all their preceding revelations and history. But this, evidently, he could not do without applying to the whole subject his great powers of logical analysis, and treating it in a systematic manner. But there was no such necessity for a harmonized scheme of truth to commend the gospel to the gentiles, because they had not been trained under these preceding revelations, and had no such providential history. This, however, is only a partial explanation of the striking fact (which will require to be more fully elucidated in the sequel) that the truth, as presented by the Lord himself, has nothing of a systematic form or character.

We come now to exhibit the direct evidence of the pre-eminent and paramount object and character of the Lord's teaching; in other words, that it was intended to reveal the truths of the spiritual world in their highest and most adequate forms, as adapted to meet and satisfy the spiritual wants of all mankind alike, without specific reference to states of mind which were peculiar to the Jewish people.

We observe, then, paradoxical as it may be, that Christ was no Jew. Though of the seed of Abraham and Israel, of the tribe of Judah, and of the royal line of David, as concerning the flesh, we cannot even imagine Him with the distinctive type of Jewish features. The Christian church has never been able so to conceive or represent His personal appearance. The earliest representation of it which has come down to us, and which, however short it may fall of being a correct likeness, certainly gives us the idea of His person which was impressed upon the minds of the primitive Christians, is as far as possible from being that of a Jew. The author once had the fortune to see a fancy portrait of the Lord, with strongly marked Jewish features, and he hopes never to see another, for it was revolting in the extreme, and such, he is well assured, it must have been to all Christians, except those of Jewish descent. Nor is there anything more wonderful or miraculous, when we consider how He was born and brought up, than His sublime exaltation above the prejudices and peculiar forms of thought, the character and whole life, of His countrymen and kindred. He did not take upon himself, in His incarnation, the nature of the Jew in distinction from the rest of mankind, but the nature of man, our common humanity. Consequently, He never speaks of himself as a Jew, nor of His brethren or kindred according to the flesh, after the manner of St. Paul. On the contrary, He disclaims, in some sort, His own blood relations. For when, on a certain occasion, it was said to Him: "Thy mother and thy brethren stand without desiring to speak

with thee... He answered, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren?.. For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother." Even His mother He never addresses by this dear and sacred name, but always simply as woman —"Woman, what have I to do with thee?" And when she stood by his cross with the prophetic sword in her heart, He committed her to the care of His beloved disciple, saying: "Woman, behold thy son." Of himself He always speaks either as "the Son of God," or "the Son of Man," thereby signifying that He was the perfect embodiment and only adequate manifestation of God, and that He included in himself and represented our common humanity as no other ever did or could do.

Now, with these views of the incarnation and person of the Lord, it can be no surprise to us, that He should give, in His teaching, no special prominence to doctrinal forms having any special relation to Jewish states of mind, such as those of election and justification. And here we have one great reason, why His personal ministry found so little acceptance with His countrymen, when "He came to his own, and his own received Him not." For although there were other causes of their fierce and rancorous hatred, which was such that it could be satisfied with nothing short of His ignominious and cruel death, yet we must bear in mind, that it did not lie in "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," that they should receive the gospel, until it should be commended unto them by that peculiar adaptation of it to their spiritual wants for which St. Paul was to be raised up and inspired. From these views, also, we might anticipate that, as delivered by the Lord, it would have that universal and perfect adaptation to the spiritual wants of mankind, irrespective of the distinction between Jew and gentile, which we have seen that it has in the case of the forgiveness of sins; moreover, that all its truths from His mouth would be declared in the highest

and most adequate forms of which they are capable in human language. But this is what we must now undertake to show.

Here, then, it is necessary to take into consideration that old common-place the significance of which, however, has never yet been exhausted, namely, that all great truths are manifold and many-sided. Hence it seldom occurs that any one definite expression can give more than a single aspect of such a truth, whilst it necessarily leaves out many others, some of which may be of equal and perhaps greater importance. Moreover, the highest, and indeed all truths of the spiritual world are transcendent and ineffable, that is to say, they cannot be adequately conceived of by the human faculties, much less adequately formulated and expressed in human words. The reason of this is, that they belong to the realm of the infinite, whilst all our faculties are finite, and all our words have necessarily a defining and limiting power. Such truths are God, in His being, attributes, purposes and providence; the soul of man, in its self-consciousness, freedom, morality and immortality; holiness and sin, mediation and redemption, heaven and hell—for what are all these but unfathomable mysteries to the finite intellect? Our most enlarged and perfect comprehension of them can be nothing better than an infant's conception of the solar system. Without the full and constant recognition of this truth, it is impossible to understand aright the revelation which God has given us. For even the parallelisms of Hebrew poetry, which represent the same idea in two balanced clauses, one supplementing the other—this mode of expression evidently sprang from a deep feeling in the sacred writers, that their best words were inadequate to their conceptions of spiritual truths, and their conceptions to the truths themselves. Hence, also, they instinctively lay hold upon metaphor, similitude, analogy—upon all the manifold forms of symbolization—aiming thereby to excite the sensibilities, stimulate the imagination,

exalt and quicken all the intellectual faculties, in order to a more enlarged receptivity of the truths which they reveal.

In consequence of this manifold, transcendent and ineffable nature of Divine truth, it cannot be fully expressed even in the words of the most plenary inspiration. The Holy Scriptures, therefore, are not to be interpreted as complete revelations, but they are to be regarded rather as index fingers pointing upwards and directing us where to look, in order that we may see for ourselves as much as we have capacity and insight for seeing of the things which words can only indicate. In all their fulness they give us nothing more than glimpses into the infinite. That which is revealed and can be known by us bears no proportion to that which is unrevealed and incapable of being known. At the same time, it is certain that all truth is one, and, consequently, every particular part of it which has been revealed bears relations to, and is conditioned and modified by, every other part of the great whole which remains unknown. We have the most striking examples of this in the modifications which were effected in the revelations of the Old Testament by the more full and perfect disclosures of the New, especially where the Lord by his own teaching completes or even supersedes what had been "said to them of old time."

Now, from all this it seems abundantly evident, that the truths of the invisible and spiritual world, as revealed to us, are incapable of being adequately systematized. For these glimpses into the infinite are comparatively so few and remote from each other that the logical connections between them cannot be accurately traced out. They constitute so small a part of the great whole to which they belong; they must be conceived of as bearing so many and such vital, yet such indeterminate relations to the infinite unknown; the forms in which they are expressed are necessarily so inadequate to the reality—that every

systematic view which can be taken of them by the finite mind, if it be regarded as absolute, or other than incomplete and provisional, cannot fail to misinterpret or distort them, and must prove the source of innumerable errors and practical evils. A partial system, so constructed, and taken for no more than what it truly is, may, indeed, have its uses for the accomplishment of subordinate objects, as in the case of St. Paul's writings to convince his countrymen, but certainly it can never give to the transcendent truths of the spiritual world their highest forms and most adequate expression. We might as well undertake to construct the map or chart of a coast from the light-houses which beam from its headlands, leaving out the bays, inlets, mouths of rivers and other indentations and projections which lie between. Such an imperfect sketch, regarded in its true character, might have its uses, but, taken as an accurate representation of the whole coast, it could lead to nothing but shipwreck and disaster.

Here, then, we have a good and sufficient reason why our Lord adopted and consistently followed that highly figurative and unsystematic method by which his teaching is so eminently distinguished from that of His apostle Paul. No other, in fact, was possible to Him, as the revealer of the spiritual world in the highest and most perfect forms in which it could be made known to us. For if he had undertaken to define and systematize the truth, to eliminate its antinomies, to harmonize its apparently conflicting aspects by tracing out the logical connections between His vast and concrete utterances, it would have been necessary for Him to reveal the whole infinite of truth, which was impossible, or to clothe these glimpses and fragments of it in lower and less adequate forms; in which latter case, He must have renounced the pre-eminent character and object in and for which, as "a Teacher sent from God," He had come into the world.

We come now to inquire how it came to pass that this

discrimination between the character and object of the Lord's teaching and that of St. Paul in his controversies with his countrymen, was not made by the great reformers of the sixteenth century, and to what extent the history of the Protestant church has been affected by regarding these objects as identical, or as on a par with each other. Nor ought we to be surprised if we should find that, from this cause alone, the church's understanding of the nature of revealed truth, her appreciation of the importance of catholic unity, her systems of theology, confessions of faith, creeds and preaching are all very different from what they would otherwise have been.

It seems quite evident, then, that the great minds of the reformation were prevented from making this discrimination by the relations which the Protestant movement bore to the papacy. For, as is well known, the church of Rome, at that time, had reached her utmost development, both in her priestly hierarchy, and in the Arminian or anti-Augustine character of her theology. What are called the Augustinian and Calvinistic, but which are properly the Pauline forms of doctrine, had well-nigh or quite disappeared from her teaching. Her leading theologians no longer perceived, as Augustine and Ambrose and Anselm had done, that those forms of truth upon which St. Paul had so strenuously insisted, though specially adapted to meet the difficulties and convince the minds of his countrymen, did yet contain the very heart and marrow of the gospel, as taught by the Master. In fact, the Scriptures themselves, from a variety of causes, had become a sealed book to the people, and were but little known even to the clergy. It was in this state of things that the reformers arose, and the first thing they did was to throw open the Bible. They studied it for themselves, and taught it to the people. Thus the great struggle and conflict commenced which shook the world to its foundations. Now, in this conflict, the most vital and the paramount interest

of Protestantism was that of successful resistance against the overshadowing authority and power of Rome; for to fail in this was to fail in everything. Hence it is hardly possible for us, at this day, to imagine how great was the delight of the reformers when, in their study of the Bible, they discovered in the Pauline epistles a perfect thesaurus of arguments against the papacy, not only against its Arminian theology, in St. Paul's systematic presentation of the decrees, foreordination, election and justification by faith, but, also, against its priestly hierarchy, founded upon and modeled after that of the Jewish church—that hierarchy which the great apostle had overthrown. Consequently and inevitably these epistles, which supplied the reformers with their keenest weapons for the conflict in which success was everything to them and their cause, came to exert a greater influence upon their minds, to shape their doctrines and mould their faith, than all the other Scriptures. It was under this all-moulding influence that they were led to adopt and imitate St. Paul's logical, argumentative and systematic presentations of truth, as the highest form of which it was capable, in preference to the alogical, unsystematic, figurative and symbolical forms in which it had been clothed by the other sacred writers in general, and, especially, by the Master himself. Thus it was that, in the all-controlling interest of making good their protest against Rome, they constructed their systems of theology, confessions of faith and creeds bodily out of St. Paul's writings, rather than as an unbiased expression of the truth, gathered from, and representing the whole word of God, with highest reference to the forms of Christ's teaching; nor could it have been otherwise in the circumstances in which they were placed.

The consequences of this systematizing spirit or tendency, which was thus developed in the church of the reformation beyond all that had ever before been known, even among the scholastic theologians, could not fail to prove disas-

trous. For although it springs from an innate striving after unity in our knowledge, which is common to human nature and, although it has many important uses, yet it requires to be held under severe restraint, after the Lord's own example, because it is naturally impatient, and the love of system is ever liable to become stronger than the love of truth, which is one most copious source of error. For, under its influence, we are sorely tempted to misunderstand, or to explain away, or even to deny the most obvious facts and truths whenever they prove refractory, as they frequently do, and refuse to take their places quietly in the speculative systems which we construct for their accommodation. But most disastrous are these consequences in the domain of theology and religion. For since, as we have seen, it requires the knowledge of the whole truth to construct the true system, and all the revelations we have amount to no more than glimpses into the infinite, it is impossible to concentrate these scattered rays in one focus without deflecting and distorting them ; in other words, these fragmentary truths cannot be placed in logical relations with each other without shaping them into other forms than those in which they stand in the Divine word. Moreover, each several truth of the gospel is so vast in itself, and involves such all-absorbing interests, that it can easily come to fill the most capacious mind, to the exclusion of other truths equally important, and no less clearly revealed. In this way, some minds become filled with the revelations which God has given of His goodness and mercy and love, and not being able to harmonize these with other attributes in the infinitude of the Divine nature, they are thus led to deny His justice, and, with their utmost diligence and ingenuity, to explain away all those innumerable passages of Scripture in which it is affirmed and emphasized. Such persons become universalists. Others, taking the freedom of man's will, which is matter of consciousness no less than of revelation, as the all-controlling

principle of their theological speculations, and not being able to bring this great truth into logical consistency with the decrees of God, do not hesitate to impugn the Divine sovereignty, nor even, in some cases, to deny the Divine foreknowledge. Hence we have Arminianism. Conversely, yet by a precisely similar process, the absoluteness of the decrees is sometimes made to rule out the freedom of the human will and man's responsibility, the result of which is fatalism and antinomianism. In like manner, there are those who insist exclusively upon the humanity of Christ, and deny His divinity, thus becoming unitarians; whilst the orthodox, who strenuously affirm His divinity, often lose the practical significance and benefit of the doctrine of His true and proper humanity, even when they would be greatly shocked at the thought of denying it in words.

Here, now, we have the root and principle of all those vast and hostile systems of theology, and of all the schisms, sects, sectarian strifes and controversies to which Protestantism has given such prodigious birth. They have all sprung from failure to recognize, in the unsystematic teaching of Christ, the highest and most adequate forms of which the truths of the spiritual world are capable in human word, and from adopting, in place of these, St. Paul's method of presentation, which was employed by him for a special and subordinate object, and which was never intended to supersede, as it has been made to do, the higher and only adequate method of St. Paul's Master. This it is which has shivered the Protestant church into a thousand disjointed and angular fragments, such that they no longer fit together as the "living stones" of that "spiritual house" which God would build for His own everlasting habitation. It is this which has well nigh obliterated from the bosoms of her people and clergy even the sentiment of catholic unity, together with the knowledge of that vital and indissoluble connection which subsists between this

unity and the conversion of the world. "Hence, also, which otherwise is the most inexplicable fact of the whole history of the church, whilst she was thus occupied in rending the body of her Lord limb from limb, and in scattering His bleeding members as far apart from each other as possible, she seems to have lost, together with the sentiment of catholic unity, all consciousness of her character as Christ's missionary society for the salvation of the world—the very object of her existence. For during the two hundred years subsequent to the reformation, the Protestant church never sent a missionary to the heathen. When it was proposed to do so, her leading minds scouted the idea. And now it is quite evident that the re-awakening of primitive sentiments on this subject, and the nascent striving after the restoration of catholic unity, of which she is becoming conscious, are chiefly due to the influence of the missionary spirit and work.

We have yet to consider the character of the preaching which has prevailed in the church of the reformation, and which, of course, has been governed and moulded by her theology, confessions and creeds. For it has presented the truths of the gospel in the forms given them by St. Paul, rather than in those which they have in the teaching of Christ. It has been eminently systematic, logical and argumentative, rather than figurative, authoritative and practical, insisting more on the *credenda*—what is to be believed—than on the *agenda*—what is to be done. It has been more occupied with the doctrines of predestination, election, and justification by faith than with the person and work of Christ, the forgiveness of sins, and salvation by faith. These statements, however, may require some qualification, especially from the rise and spread of Methodism, which must be understood as a protest and reaction against the above prevailing tendencies. That this is the character of the great Methodist movement is evident, among other and better things, from the notorious undervaluation which

it places upon the writings of St. Paul. Yet, in connection with this error, it has been led to a better appreciation than otherwise it might have attained of the forms of truth in the Lord's personal teaching, as peculiarly adapted to the masses of mankind. Hence the vast influence which it exerts upon the less cultivated classes, and the unparalleled growth of the denomination.

Meanwhile, the doctrinal preaching which has prevailed in most of the Protestant communions has continued to represent St. Paul's discussions with his countrymen, rather than Christ's proclamations of the gospel to mankind. It still addresses gentile congregations in those forms of truth which were originally intended and adapted to meet Jewish difficulties, and to commend the gospel to the Jewish mind, precisely as if the people had been born and educated Jews. It warns them against Judaizing errors, to which they have never had any temptation, whilst their real dangers often lie in the opposite direction. It offers them salvation under the form of being accepted as righteous, and spends itself in abstruse and elaborate discussions, after the manner of St. Paul, to render it acceptable to them in this form, when they have never felt the need of any such righteousness, but their souls, it may be, are crying out for the pardon of their sins and reconciliation with God. It takes no less pains to convince them that they are delivered from the law, as a condition of justification, than if they had the same difficulties on this point with those who for thirty generations "were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." And if it were not that common sense has had some little influence to neutralize speculative absurdities, it would still be laboring to convince the people that the ritual law was of temporary obligation, that it has been fulfilled and superseded by the sacrifice of Christ, that circumcision is no longer necessary, and that the priesthood of Christ is superior to that of Aaron—of all which, in so far as

they believe anything, they have never had a doubt, and which never had a particle of interest for any but Jews.

It must be acknowledged, however, that this preaching formerly had enormous power with the people, which can be comprehended only from the peculiar circumstances in which the church was placed. For whilst the paramount object of all Protestant Christians was that of success in their life-and-death struggle with the power of Rome, these Pauline forms of doctrine—justification by faith, predestination and election—were their battle-cry in defence of their dearest liberties, and against their deadliest enemies. Hence their interest in sermons in which these doctrines were the staple of argument and the themes of impassioned declamation could be sustained hour after hour, on each occasion; and from their worshipping assemblies they went away rejoicing and triumphing in the victories which, through the valiant leadership of their favorite ministers, they had thus achieved over Antichrist. This is the secret of that vast power which this preaching undeniably possessed, whilst the great conflict raged with doubtful results throughout the civilized world.

But the circumstances of the church have become very different now that the ultimate triumph of the Protestant cause is no longer doubtful, and success in this conflict is no longer the paramount interest. For Rome has been shorn of her temporal and persecuting power; the currents of human thought and advancing civilization have all set in against the Vatican; now it is felt that indifference to religion, scepticism, infidelity and immorality are enemies more to be feared than the effete papacy. Consequently this preaching, in the manner and forms of St. Paul's epistles rather than in those of Christ's teaching, has lost its interest for the people—an interest which it can never more regain. For it is self-evident that the logical and abstruse discussions in these epistles cannot be intelligently comprehended by any but well-educated and

trained minds; nor could it have been anticipated by the apostle that they would be intelligible to the common people among the gentiles, for, as we have seen, they were not originally addressed to them, but to those who had inherited the results of fifteen hundred years' education and training in the ideas which constituted the staple of his arguments, and to whom these ideas were as familiar as household words. Such preaching could not fail to lose its power, because it does not feed the souls of the people. When they ask for bread, it offers them, not, indeed, a stone, but spiritual food prepared and seasoned for Jewish palates, for which they have no genuine relish or appetite. Hence the churches which were formerly crowded are now so thinly attended, whilst great masses of the people have fallen out altogether from under the influence of the gospel, have become hopelessly alienated from the religion of their fathers, and are living, if life it can be called, in a state of Godlessness which is worse than heathenism. For it has been estimated that, of the four millions of inhabitants of the city of London, not more than four hundred thousand have ever seen the inside of a church. The large cities of America are hardly in a better condition; whilst, of those who continue to attend the worship of the sanctuary, there are multitudes who prefer the grossest sensational exhibitions in the pulpit to this kind of "doctrinal preaching:" and not without reason do they prefer that which awakens some sort of emotion to this which produces none at all.

If, now, we have rightly appreciated the significance of these differences between our Lord Jesus Christ and His apostle Paul, with respect to the forms in which they exhibit the truth of the gospel, it would seem that we need another reformation hardly inferior to that of the sixteenth century. In fact, the man to head such a movement is the great want of our time. We want another Luther, who shall be able to free his mind from the authority of the

last three hundred years of the church's history, to think himself out of the errors in which he must have been born and educated, as the great and heroic souls of that day had to do—a man with Luther's pen for the intelligent and cultivated, and Luther's voice for the masses of the people—the times in which we live cry out for such a man, and it would seem that his advent cannot be much longer delayed.

What, then, from the preceding discussion, may we humbly and reverently anticipate will be the burden of his message when he comes? If we have not erred altogether, he can hardly fail to treat with some of Luther's scorn the notion of a progress in the revelations of the New Testament, by means of disciples and subordinates, beyond those which were delivered by the Master himself. He will recognize, in the unsystematic and symbolical teaching of Christ, the highest, most adequate, and every way the most perfect forms of which the truths of the spiritual world are capable in human words. He will brand with some of Luther's contempt that systematizing spirit and method which presumes to exhibit, for the supply of the spiritual wants of mankind, a more symmetrical and harmonious scheme of doctrine than that which Christ himself revealed; which perverts and distorts the revelations of His mouth; which misunderstands one of His declarations, explains away another, and denies everything which cannot be successfully manipulated; in order that the mutilated remnants may be made to fit and dovetail together in logical connections. He will find in the schism of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin by the worship of the golden calves—in consequence of which the people of God were involved in long and bloody civil wars, so that they could no longer subdue the heathen, but were themselves subdued and carried away into captivity and bondage to the powers of this world, from which only a remnant ever returned—in all this terrible historic symbol,

our coming Luther will find prefigured, in graphic details, the schisms, sectarianism and theological wars of the last three hundred years, during which the church lost all consciousness of her high calling to save the heathen, set up the idolatry of material wealth and comfort, and sold herself into captivity to the world. With trumpet voice he will recall the remnant of God's people out of this worse than Babylonish and Egyptian bondage, and lead them back into spiritual freedom and true holiness, so that they will be enabled to exhibit, in the restoration of catholic unity, that sign from God upon which He has covenanted that the world shall believe and be saved. He will trample under his feet, or burn in the market-place, as Luther burned the pope's bull, all essentially sectarian creeds and symbols, as not conformed to the Lord's deliverances, and as making no due allowances for those differences of opinion in non-essentials which are inseparable from various degrees of intellectual ability, culture and spiritual enlightenment, and which are necessary elements of all healthy growth and progress. He will believe in and proclaim the gift and indwelling of the Holy Spirit in all true believers to guide them into all necessary truths, so that they can never be left to go fatally astray, and shall have no need of extended formularies, devised and imposed upon them by human authority; and surely he will understand the essentials of the catholic faith as they were understood when the Apostles' Creed was the only doctrinal symbol of the church.

Finally, we venture to forecast that our coming Luther will set us a new example of preaching in the manner of Christ in the Gospels, rather than in that of St. Paul in his discussions with his countrymen. He will not preach to gentiles as if they were Jews, and had Jewish prejudices and difficulties to overcome. The staple of his sermons will not be the secret purposes of God, but things revealed; not predestination, nor election, nor justification by faith,

but the person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ, the efficacy of His most holy sacrifice, the forgiveness of sins, reconciliation with God, and salvation by faith. He will address his preaching to those spiritual wants which all men can feel, rather than to those into which they must be laboriously educated before they can feel them. And, so preaching, the common people will hear him gladly, as they heard the Master when He was on earth in the flesh; so that, the bread of life being offered them as the Lord offered it, they will no longer run to the Circean swine-troughs of sensationalism; and then the vast multitudes who now seem to be hopelessly alienated from the church will return to her sacred pale.

XVIII

CREEDS AND CONFESSIONS

He that sat upon the throne said: Behold, I make all things new . . . And I saw a new heaven and a new earth . . . The commandment is a lamp, and the law is light . . . To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.

THE most important and most difficult of all the social problems seems to be that of the adjustment, in their mutual relations, of the progressive and conservative forces. Its difficulty arises, in great part, from the vast number and complexity of these forces; from their far-reaching influence, which extends beyond all human foresight; from their apparent, and, in one sense, actual conflict with each other; and from the fact, that they are constantly requiring re-adjustment, the reason of which will appear in the sequel. Its importance is evident from this, that when rigorously analyzed, it is found to include nearly or quite all others upon which the progress and welfare of society, both civil and ecclesiastical, depend. For, notwithstanding the apparent conflict between these two classes of societary forces, all true progress is the resultant of their harmonious interaction. If either of them becomes excessive, so as to absorb or neutralize the other, one of two disastrous consequences inevitably follows; namely, either the precious accumulations which have been provided for us by preceding generations are swept away, or thought and life fall into stagnation and corruption. On the one hand, we cannot afford to throw away any of the

capital, intellectual, moral, or material, which we have inherited from the labors and struggles of our forefathers, for by as much of it as is lost are we the poorer, and our future progress is retarded. On the other hand, it is no less essential that we should be prompt to relinquish whatever is worthless or cumbersome, to correct the errors of tradition and prescription, and cordially to welcome new discoveries and new views of truth and duty—everything, indeed, which gives reasonable promise of better results than have been hitherto attained. For where this is wanting, whether from over-estimate of the past, or underestimate of the future, from too much deference to authority, or undue distrust of reason and science, there the human mind loses its vitality and sinks into imbecility—it becomes incapable even of utilizing what has been previously accumulated. In the presence of the noblest monuments of former wisdom and energy, instead of being stimulated and quickened, it is stupefied and paralyzed; as the modern Egyptians cannot believe that the pyramids were built by their forefathers, nor, indeed, by any human power, but regard them as the work of supernatural beings, the Genii or Gins of oriental mythology.

Now, for the solution of this grand problem, we cannot surely do better than to take heed to the word of God, who presides over the history of the world, and orders all things according to the counsel of His own wisdom. Here, if anywhere, we must apply to the direction which He has given us in the words: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them," or, literally rendered, "because there is no morning to them," in which, since morning is the increase of light, there seems to be an allusion to progressive illumination.

We proceed, therefore, to observe, that the Holy Scriptures, although containing a fixed and unchangeable rule of life, do yet contemplate and make ample provision for

human development and progress, both in the church and in society at large. In fact, they are a record of marvellous progress from the sacrifice of Abel to that of the Lord Jesus Christ, and from the promise that the 'Seed of the woman should crush the serpent's head' to its glorious fulfilment on the cross of Calvary, in the resurrection of Christ, and in the planting of the first Christian churches throughout the Roman empire. Everywhere they glow and flame with promise and hope. Even in the midst of reaction and declension, when everything in the church and in society is enveloped in Egyptian darkness, when spiritual life is at its lowest ebb, the Hebrew prophets never waver in their predictions of the good times that are to come, when "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." As the darkness thickens around them, their prophecies of the future glory pour forth with ever clearer light and certainty. Thus their utterances are wonderfully distinguished from all merely human compositions. For to them is utterly unknown that despair of the future which makes the words of Tacitus and Juvenal sound like the wail of lost souls. The sense of Scripture from beginning to end is, that the future shall be better than the past; and in the closing book of the canon the prophecies of millennial glory are more full and glowing than any which precede them.

The provision which the Scriptures make for such assured progress is ample and manifold. For, in the first place, the Son of God, by His incarnation, has taken upon himself our nature, has deposited himself in the bosom of the human race, and identified himself with its whole subsequent history; and by faith man is brought into vital union with Him—a union like that between the vine and its branches—whereby he is made partaker of the infinite and exhaustless life of God, and thus capable of development and progress, not only as an individual, but also as a race, from generation to genera-

tion, and from age to age. Secondly, the Scriptures reveal the truths of the spiritual world, which are the bread of life to the human soul, in forms adapted to all capacities, all degrees of receptivity, and all stages of human progress. For, generally, and eminently in the words of Christ himself, they embody and express the most profound and sublime truths in sensuous forms, so that children and babes in knowledge can lay hold and feed upon them; and whilst they are thus milk for babes, they are inexhaustible as food for the most advanced and exalted minds and strongest spiritual natures, because they do ever contain an element of that which is infinite. Hence it is that they are, in general, so free from precise definitions, which, as we have seen in a previous study, can be nothing better than limitations of the illimitable. All this is abundantly exemplified in their constant use of images, figures, emblems, parables, types and symbols, as, also, in those numerous prophecies which contemplate a series or succession of historical events, such as those in which the first advent of the Lord is predicted, but which do still await their crowning fulfilment in His second coming.

This peculiar character of the Holy Scriptures goes far to explain why they have no tendency to become obsolete, but possess, for the successive generations of mankind, unfading freshness and inexhaustible power. In this respect, they are like the unchangeable principles of morality, so admirably characterized by the Greek poet as follows: "Sublime laws have been prescribed, which originated above the celestial ether, of which Heaven alone is the father, nor did any mortal nature of men produce them, neither shall oblivion ever put them to sleep; great in these is God, and He does not grow old:* and, again,

* . . . Νόμοι πρόκεινται
Ὑψίποδες οὐρανίαν δι' αἰθέρα
Τεκνωθέντες ὧν Ολυμπος
Πατὴρ μόνος, οὐδέ νιν θνατὰ

"They are not anything of to-day and yesterday, but they live forever."* Hence the account which the Word gives us of the creation, sin and fall of man has all the significance and interest for us now that it ever had. Abraham's sacrifice of his son is as full of instruction and quickening power to the people of God in these days as it was to the ancient patriarchs and prophets. The rock of Horeb, smitten by the rod of Moses, and thereupon giving forth its abundant streams of living water to quench the thirst of the many thousands of Israel, has even a deeper and richer meaning for us than it had for them. The brazen serpent in the wilderness represents more of saving truth to our minds than it did to those who were healed by looking upon it of the deadly poison in their veins. The prophecies of our Lord's coming are more full of hope to us, when we understand them aright, than they were to those who lived before His first advent. All true Christians, as they make spiritual progress, have abundant experience of this perpetual freshness, and of constantly renewed interest, in the sacred Scriptures. The more purified and exalted our spiritual life becomes, the more do we find in them to nourish and perfect it. Truths and views of truth which, in the earlier stages of our experience, were dimly seen or altogether veiled, blaze out upon their pages, as we ad-

> *Φύσις ἀνέρων ἔτικεν, οὐδέ*
> *Μάν ποτε λαθα κατακοιμάσει·*
> *Μέγας ἐν τούτοις Θεος*
> *Οὐδέ γηράσκει.*
>
> *Soph. Oed. Tyr.* 865–871.

The preposition δι' in the second line, has proved a great puzzle to Greek scholars, and some editors have conjecturally emended the text to relieve the difficulty. But there is no need of any change, for the thought of the poet, more fully expressed, is, that these laws originated and came down to men *through*—*i. e.* from above—the heavenly ether.

* *Οὐ γαρ τι νῦν τε κἀχθὲς αλλ' ἀεί ποτε*
Ζῇ. *Ib. Antig.* 454.

vance, with overpowering splendor, so that we are often amazed that we have never seen them before, or that they made so little impression upon our minds. Thus Bunyan somewhere says: "The meaning of Scripture often comes upon me with such power that I am scarce able to stand up under it."

In these and other ways, the Holy Scriptures, though in themselves unchangeable, make abundant provision for human progress, especially in spiritual life and ecclesiastical society, of which they must ever continue to be the inexhaustible source, the perpetual norm and law. And, hence, if we are ever to have the progressive and conservative forces any better adjusted to each other than they are now, of which we cannot doubt, we must draw the principles of such re-adjustment more carefully from "the law and the testimony," and give them a more full and perfect realization.

With respect now to the nature of this spiritual progress which we are thus led to anticipate, and which, indeed, is contained in the common expectation of the millennium, it must needs be conceived of as a great increase in the church of both life and light—as a general attainment of more perfect knowledge of revealed truth, of a higher degree of sanctification, and of greater spiritual power to overcome and save the world. For all such progress in the past has included these elements, and we cannot conceive but that it should be so in the future. It is true, indeed, as a great poet, though with the common misunderstanding of the transaction to which he alludes, has said:

The Tree of Knowledge is not that of Life.

For life does not always keep pace with light. A man may know everything, and yet be nothing: "Though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge . . . and have not charity, I am noth-

ing . . . Since ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." But the converse of this does not hold good; for though there may be light without life, there cannot be life without light, nor any increase of spiritual life without a corresponding increase of spiritual light—of Divine knowledge—of the knowledge of revealed truth. For such increase of light is necessarily contained or implied in every increase of life, either as its cause or as its consequence. Either we obtain, first, through the study of the Word, a deeper insight into its truths—a more profound, or enlarged, or, in some way, a better knowledge of them—by which our spiritual nature is nourished and strengthened unto a purer and higher life; or, through our vital union with God in Christ, and by the indwelling of His Holy Spirit in our souls, we obtain an increase and exaltation of spiritual life, whereby our minds are enlightened unto a better knowledge of revealed truth. Hence, in the Word itself, we have these two elements of spiritual progress sometimes in one order, and sometimes in the other, as in the following quotations: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life . . . The Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation . . . In Him was life, and the life was the light of men . . . If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." At other times, the two are identified, as in the following: "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." The truth evidently is, that life and light are reciprocal influences, whose natural tendencies are to purify and exalt each other. Moreover, of the increase of light from life, we have many striking examples in the death-bed experiences of God's dear saints, when the spiritual world seems to be opened, in some sort, to their interior faculties, as, also, in our own common experience of new and more precious views of revealed truth as we draw

nearer to God, and become more largely receptive of the life of Christ in our souls.

Here, then, we see how far from the truth they are who would persuade us that "theology is not a progressive science," and that "whatever is true in it is not new, and whatever is new is not true." For by this they do not mean that all its facts and truths are contained in the completed canon of Scripture, which has now been before the mind of the church for almost two thousand years, for that is a mere truism which no sound theologian has ever disputed. But, if they mean anything, it must be, that no new views of revealed truth can be true—that no new light can be thrown on the contents of Scripture. This must be their meaning, if they have any, which may be doubted, for it is absurd, and inconsistent with their own professions, inasmuch as some of them, in their voluminous writings, claim to have thrown much new light on the meaning of Scripture—for what else, indeed, have they written? And what is Biblical theology but the science of formulating, in some sort of system, the truths of Divine revelation, which, of course, must be done by uninspired and fallible men according to the degree of spiritual light which they may possess; and to say that this can never be done any better than it has been in former times, is absurd, and a denial of the possibility of progress. For since, as we have seen, there can be no increase of life without a corresponding increase of light, we can never, according to this view, become any better than we are now—spiritual progress in life, no less than in light, is thus effectually barred.

But, now, from the certainty of spiritual progress, accepted as a fact both of revelation and experience, it follows, by inevitable necessity, that every merely human scheme of doctrine, such as our creeds and confessions of faith, must be regarded as fallible and defective, and must be held subject to revision and correction. For wherever

there is any progress at all, it means, as we here see, the attainment of more light—a deeper insight into spiritual things—more profound, or comprehensive, or, in some way, better views of revealed truth; in consequence of which, former schemes of doctrine, made and adopted at a less advanced stage, are necessarily felt to be inadequate, and, to some extent at least, unsuitable, if not positively erroneous. How can it be otherwise if they are not, and Holy Scripture alone is infallible? As a single example of this, we might compare the Heidelberg catechism with the Westminster confession a century later, on the Sabbath and on the nature of faith; for, in the former, the essence is confounded with the assurance of faith, and we have no Sabbath at all, whilst, in the latter, we have the distinction between the essence and assurance of faith clearly drawn, and the Christian Sabbath is presented in its true Scriptural character and obligations Now who can estimate the vast practical importance of these differences? The progress of spiritual light here indicated is simply immense. And what pressing need of revision and correction of former statements of doctrine must have been felt by the Westminster divines when they undertook their great work, which has so powerfully influenced the subsequent history of the church and the world! A similar need is felt also in the individual experience of every growing Christian. For if we had undertaken to formulate our doctrinal views at the commencement of our Christian life, is it possible that the system which we should have formed then would satisfy us now? If so, it would prove that we have made little or no progress either in thought or life. And here, as elsewhere, individual experience represents that of the church at large, of which it constitutes the most fundamental element; so that if, after a sufficient time, no want is felt in the church of revising her former statements, that is sure evidence of her failure to make progress—that her thought and life have become

stationary, stagnant, and tending to corruption. For in church life, as in that of individuals, where there is no progress, there is always backsliding.

In such a state of stagnation, moreover, there arises an almost irresistible temptation to ascribe to the church's former deliverances that unchangeableness and authority which belong to the word of God alone, so that, practically, if not in theory, they are placed upon a level with the Scriptures themselves. It was precisely in this way the church of Rome came to arrogate to herself that infallibility which now constitutes one element of her strength as an organization, and her greatest weakness as a spiritual power. For the claim which she makes to this incommunicable attribute of God and of His word releases, as we have seen in a previous study, her members from the awful responsibility of thinking for themselves, and thus satisfies a morbid craving which is more or less common to all men. Hence her enormous power over the unthinking masses of mankind. At the same time, this preposterous claim renders it impossible for her to correct the errors of her past deliverances, and dooms her, if she will not surrender it, to inevitable death and burial, as the light of millennial glory dawns upon the world. Thus, also, it was with the Old Testament church when, unmindful of the lessons of progress of which her Scriptures and her history were full, she allowed herself to become so enslaved to tradition that she could not raise her eyes to the new light which blazed upon her from heaven in the advent of her long-expected Messiah. Similar temptations are common to man. All the Protestant communions are now threatened with a similar fate, which, therefore, requires to be guarded against with sleepless and prayerful vigilance.

Thus we see that a true and living progress in the church cannot fail to manifest itself in a need felt, at least by individuals, of revising her former statements of doctrine. But this is not to be expected in the received leaders of

religious thought, who may chance to occupy the highest positions, and to whom it is natural that all things should seem to be well enough as they are, and that they themselves should be averse to change. For they are like the summits of the high mountains, on which the beams of the morning sun are often obscured by the clouds which hang around them, whilst the quickening light and heat reach many a modest flower in the clefts of the rocks below, and even penetrate the forest-gloom of the valleys. Hence it seems to be a law of reformations that they arise from below, as in the cases of Luther and the Lord's first disciples: "For . . . not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called. But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and . . . the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty, and the base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, and things which are not, to bring to nought the things that are." It is true, however, that men may clamor for revision and change who have made no progress at all, and who, in spiritual light, are so far below the church's accepted creeds that they cannot even understand them; just as the Talmudists undertook to supplement the deliverances of Moses with their oral law, when they had shamefully lost the true sense of their inspired Scriptures. Nevertheless, whenever there is real progress, there must always be some, whether in high or low stations, who truly discern the errors or inadequateness of former statements, and who deeply feel the need of revision, before this comes to be felt by the church at large. How, then, ought such persons to be treated? Upon this question, which evidently is one of fundamental importance, it would appear that the most frightful errors now prevail.

Indeed, the position of those who have made greatest progress in any communion or denomination of Christians, especially if they are pastors or professors in theological

seminaries, is one of great difficulty and embarrassment. For in the claim itself to superior light, which all who advocate any change are obliged to make, they necessarily expose themselves to the charge of presumption, self-conceit and arrogance, than which, to sensitive minds, nothing is more painful to bear. And if, from fear of such charges, or from any other motive, they keep silence, to which they are mightily tempted, they become conscious of falsehood and infidelity to the truth and to the church. Thus they fall under condemnation in their own consciences, and hence into a state of mental and spiritual paralysis, where their light becomes darkness itself. On the other hand, if they speak out boldly, and declare in what particulars the creed of their denomination appears to them to need correction, immediately they hear on all sides such a clamor as can hardly fail to blast their influence and usefulness, drive them from their pulpits or theological chairs, and reduce them to starvation. From all quarters they are assailed with the cry: You are violating your covenant engagements to hold and teach nothing inconsistent with the doctrinal standards of the church to which you belong —vows which you solemnly and voluntarily took upon your souls at your ordination and induction—vows which if you can no longer fulfil, in common honesty you ought to withdraw from the church.

Now this view of the duty of such men, however plausible it may be, and however irrefutable it may seem to those who hold it, gives, as we here maintain, a fatal preponderance to the conservative, so as to neutralize the progressive forces in ecclesiastical society. It renders freedom of thought, which is its life, in the clergy impossible, and hence, also, it is inconsistent with our dearest personal rights, and with the true idea of the church of Christ. For it assumes that the church is a mere voluntary society, from which every man has a right to withdraw whenever he pleases. But this is not true. The church is no volun-

tary society, but the body of the Lord, whose members have no more right to separate themselves from her communion for any cause whatsoever than a member of the human body has to amputate itself. The organism alone has authority over its own organs to determine when the amputation of any of them may be necessary. In answer to this, it is commonly said that he who is not satisfied with his church's creed may join some other church. But this is to justify the division of the one church of Christ into all those different sects which now exist, and which surely ought to be regarded as inconsistent with her spiritual and Scriptural unity. Such advice the apostles never give, and manifestly could not give, nor can it fairly be drawn from any precept or direction in the word of God. On the contrary, when something like these divisions made its appearance in the church at Corinth, the apostle Paul smote it on the head with his sledge-hammer, once for all, in the words following: "Every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" Here we see that these sectarian divisions signified to his mind the dividing asunder of the Lord himself. But waiving this for the present, since it will come up again in the sequel, what if the poor man to whom such advice is given loves his brethren, with whom he has associated all his life, and cannot bear the thought of being separated from them? Nay, what if he loves his church, the church of his fathers, in which he was born and has been brought up, which is his spiritual mother, with whose mother's milk he has been nourished, and upon whose mystic bosom he would account it his highest privilege to die—what if he loves and honors her above everything but God, and for her prosperity would gladly lay down his life? And what if there be no other branch of the church with whose creed he so fully agrees, and in whose worship and order he finds anything like the

same power and sweetness and spiritual consolation? Ah! it seems plain enough that they who so confidently give this advice have no conception of what a cruel and bitter thing it is, nor, indeed, of true loyalty to the church.

But this is by no means the worst of the case; for rather than take such advice, a conscientious man may prefer to stand a judicial trial for heresy or false doctrine, which, if he continues to speak out, he can hardly escape. Now when so brought to trial, he is not allowed by the common usages of church courts to defend himself by appealing from the fallible standards of doctrine adopted by his sect to the infallible testimony of the word of God. If he attempt to do this, the court will gravely inform him that the question on which he is tried is, not what the Scriptures teach, but whether he believes and teaches what is laid down in his church's creed or confession of faith. This has often been done; and thus, in such trials, all appeal 'to the law and the testimony' is cut off, and the Holy Scripture, by which everything ought to be finally determined, is actually ruled out of court.

Now this whole procedure, we maintain, is utterly inconsistent with the most fundamental principle of the Protestant reformation, and a practical return to the papal doctrine of the infallibility of the church. For, practically, if not in theory, it sets her statements of doctrine above the authority of the Scriptures; in strenuous opposition to all which, the principles of the reformation require that the direct appeal from all human creeds to the word of God should be always in place, and, most of all, in trials for heresy and false doctrine. For it was on this ground precisely, as all men know, that Luther took his stand in his world-famous trial before the diet of Worms, where he concluded his defence with the sublime and ever-memorable words: "Let me be confuted and convinced by the testimony of Scripture. Here I take my stand. I can do no otherwise. God help me." Thus it was, by the action of

this epoch-making man, that the direct appeal from all creeds and confessions of faith ever made or adopted by the church to the infallible word of God became the most fundamental principle of the Protestant reformation, which represents nothing so much as the protest of the free human soul against the assumed infallibility of church deliverances, the right of private judgment to interpret the Scriptures, and the responsibility of the conscience to God alone. Hence no church court has, or can have, any authority to prohibit such appeal—it is an inalienable right of the accused—and if he can convince the court before which he is tried that his faith and teaching are in accord with the Scriptures, it is their duty to acquit and justify him, no matter how opposed his doctrines may be to the church's creed or confession, otherwise they forfeit their claim to be a court of Jesus Christ. The consequence of such an issue of a trial before a court of last resort could be nothing worse than that the church would be obliged to revise and correct her previous statements in accordance with it.

It is true that many objections may be urged against this course, but it seems quite evident that all of them taken together, and allowed their utmost force, are not worthy to be compared with the measureless evil of denying to the accused the inalienable right of appeal to the highest and only infallible law, and of thus ruling the authority of Christ out of his own courts. Moreover, the positive advantages of such appeal would be immense; for it would bring all church judicatories, and through them the whole church, into much closer and more vital communion with the word of God, which is the one source of spiritual light and true progress, and would act as a powerful check upon the fatal tendency which has been indicated to ascribe a practical infallibility to fallible schemes of doctrine. No doubt, also, it would secure, with quite as much certainty as the method now in vogue,

the conviction of real heretics, and their condemnation would be much more efficacious to maintain soundness and purity of doctrine.

In addition to all this, what must be the consequences to the church herself of such extrusion, whether by judicial process, or by requiring them to withdraw from her communion, of all those who come to feel any need of revising her former deliverances? What provision for, or possibility of progress does she leave herself? What became of the Roman church when, acting on this principle, she cast out Luther and the other reformers from her bosom? What has she been, from that day to this, but an organization fighting against the progress of society and the providence of God? Such, beyond a peradventure, must be the fate of every other communion which has no place for those great and heroic souls whom God raises up from time to time, to whom He imparts superior light, and whom He thus calls to lead His people up out of bondage to effete traditions into a new and nobler and purer life. Every such communion must inevitably perish from the suffocating pressure of indurated and obsolete forms of thought, and from the practical assumption of infallibility the same in substance with that which has already doomed the papacy to destruction.

We find strong confirmation of these views also in the fact, that they enable us to comprehend, in some sort, that wonderful quickening which the reformation imparted to the human mind, and how, through its influence, so many men of eminent greatness were raised up. For that there were giants in those days, such as, in theology at least, we have not now, is generally admitted, nor can it be doubted by any who are acquainted with their writings, or with what they accomplished. How did this happen? Why, it is commonly answered, it was manifestly providential—God raises up great men for great occasions. But this is little more than a truism—it offers us no rational explana-

tion of the fact, such as there must be, if we could only find it. We submit the following: God, by His providence, laid upon the men of those times the awful responsibility of thinking and praying themselves out of the inadequate and erroneous forms of doctrinal statement and belief which had prevailed in the church for a thousand years, which they had inherited from their forefathers with their very existence, in which they had been educated, and under which all their faculties had been formed and moulded—and upon them He laid the no less awful responsibility of providing new statements of doctrine, such as should be more Scriptural and more adequate to the intellectual, moral, and spiritual wants of the incoming future. Now, in such strenuous exercise of their faculties, under such responsibilities, they attained to independence and freedom of thought and action, through which alone is the most exalted greatness, whether of intellect or character, attainable. For before they could break away from the authority of the past, and bring themselves to think independently, they must have endured the most agonizing mental and spiritual conflicts. We know something of what Luther suffered in this way from the records he has left us, such as the following extract from one of his letters to a still hesitating friend.

, You must feel yourself awed, he says, in the presence of a succession of learned men, and by the consent of so many ages, during which flourished scholars so conversant in sacred literature, and martyrs illustrious by so many miracles . . . On their side are ranged learning, genius, numbers, dignity, station, power, sanctity, miracles . . . On mine, Wickliffe and Laurentius Valla, and, though you forget to mention him, Augustine also. Then comes Luther, a man born yesterday, supported by only a few friends, who have neither learning, nor genius, nor greatness, nor sanctity, nor miracles. Put them all together, and . . . what are they? . . . I confess it is with reason you pause in such a presence as this. For ten years together I hesitated myself . . . I call God to witness that I should have hesitated until now, if the truth had not compelled

me to speak . . . Oh! what pain it has cost me . . . to defend myself to my own heart for having dared to resist the pope, and to denounce him as Antichrist! What have been the afflictions of my bosom! How often, in the bitterness of my soul, have I pressed myself with the papist's argument? Are you alone wise? Are all others in error? Have they been in error for so long time? What if you yourself are mistaken, and are dragging with you so many souls into eternal condemnation? Thus did I reason with myself, till Jesus Christ, by His own infallible word, tranquillized my heart.

Such words from this great and heroic soul, if we are able to sympathize with him at all by having been constrained to depart in the least from received opinions and stereotyped forms of belief, do stir the depths of our spiritual and immortal nature. And here we have the secret of the reformers' excellent greatness. It arose from their venturing to think for themselves—from the exercise of their faculties in scrutinizing tradition and rejecting its errors, in making over anew all their beliefs, and in drawing their faith, not from prescribed systems of theology, creeds, or confessions which had been handed down to them from the past, but immediately from the word of God. Hence also the intellectual greatness of Bacon and Shakespeare, and of all that is represented by these venerable names: and the reason why we have not such men now is, because it is almost universally held that we have no need to do what they did. When it shall come to be generally felt that we have a similar need to think and pray ourselves out of the errors of tradition, and to draw all our beliefs immediately from the infallible Word, we shall once more attain to independence and freedom of thought, and equally great minds will again make their appearance in the church and in the world.

But here it will be asked, What changes are required in the reformed confessions? Wherein do they fail to set forth the truth of God as contained in His word? This is altogether a pertinent question, and, as such, it demands a frank and direct answer. It should be premised, how-

ever, that the notion of uninspired men being able, at any time, to formulate the truth of the Scriptures so that their work, however excellent, shall never need to be revised and corrected, is inconsistent with the law of human progress, contrary to all experience, and in itself preposterous. We may be certain, therefore, on this *à priori* ground, that our confessions and creeds, prepared two and three hundred years ago, have become more or less inadequate to our present necessities, whether we have the superior light to discern and specify particulars, or not. But we need not confine ourselves to this general statement; for, if we take the Westminster Confession as an example, for which purpose none could be more suitable, we shall find it easy to point out numerous particulars wherein it fails to represent the truths of the gospel in their true Scriptural relations.

Beginning, then, with a few minor particulars, though in themselves of no little importance, this great "system of doctrine" contains a great deal too much. This will more fully appear hereafter. And one of the ways in which its bulk might be much and profitably reduced is, by excluding all philosophical explanations of its doctrines, such as that which it gives of the way in which original sin is transmitted from parents to their children. For he who is commonly regarded as one of the greatest of modern theologians, the late lamented Dr. Charles Hodge, has assured us that these philosophical explanations are not at all essential to the system; and we ourselves have heard him say that, "if we had to make it *de novo*, we would not put so much into it." Also, the word "elect" ought certainly to be left out of the clause, "Elect infants dying in infancy," because it is a perfectly fair inference from this word that some infants are not of the elect, and, consequently, are predestinated to eternal damnation—which, probably, was the belief of the Westminster divines, and originated their use of the expression; for it was held and avowed by Calvin, although he acknowledged

that it was "an awful doctrine." * Hence it is currently charged upon those branches of the church who hold to this confession that they believe in the damnation of infants, and it is hardly possible to measure the harm which they have thus suffered. Again, the declaration that "the pope of Rome . . . is that Antichrist, that man of sin, that son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ and all that is called God," ought to be cancelled; for it is based upon a very obscure text of Scripture, where there is evidently room for difference of opinion among the best interpreters, and a confession of faith should contain nothing which is subject to any reasonable doubt. The pope may be a great part, and not necessarily the whole, of that baleful power. Also, the statement that "no man is able . . . by any grace received in this life, perfectly to keep the commandments of God," requires to be modified; for assuredly no limitation should ever be laid upon Divine grace, and this ground is sufficiently covered by the Scriptural declaration, "There is none that doeth good, no, not one." Moreover, to the present enumeration of the ordinary means of grace, as those of "the Word, Sacraments and Prayer," there should be added that of charity to the poor, and liberality for benevolent objects; for it is well understood now that this is a Scriptural, and one of the most blessed means of grace. The reason why it was not included in the above enumeration was, no doubt, because benevolence in money-giving was hardly known in the Protestant church in the time of the Westminster assembly—missionary and other benevolent enterprises were almost or quite unknown. Such progress has been made in the life of the church since that day. These are only examples of a great number of minor changes which might be safely and profitably made.

* Unde factum est, ut tot gentes,un a cum liberis eorum infantibus, æterna morte involveret lapsus Adæ absque remedio, nisi quia Deo ita visam est? . . . Decretum quidem horribile fateor.—*Inst. Cal.* III. 23, 7.

Of much greater importance, however, is the fact, that the confession, as it now stands, makes no reference to the missionary and benevolent work of the church. It contains, indeed, a chapter on missions; but this does not at all contemplate the foreign work, which, in the theological strifes of the times, was entirely lost sight of by the Protestant communions. Manifestly it requires to be amended, so that it shall contain a full authorization of the foreign missionary and other benevolent boards—those great teleological organs by which the whole life of the church is now so powerfully influenced and moulded. It seems to be nothing less than a scandal that all these should be, to say the least, extra-constitutional. And here we see, in the organization of these boards, and in the growth of their work, what will more fully appear hereafter, how the progress of thought and life does ever transcend prescribed constitutional forms, and require that these should be frequently revised and conformed to it.

With respect now to matters of doctrine, that of the freedom of the human will, in this confession, is entirely overshadowed and, indeed, negatived by the disproportionate development which is given to that of the Divine decrees. It is true, we have the following declaration: "God hath endowed the will of man with that natural liberty that it is neither forced, nor by any absolute necessity of nature, determined to good or evil." But, from what follows, we see that the practical significance of this great truth is intended to be limited to unfallen humanity, for it is immediately added: "Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation." Thus we see that nothing is made of the freedom of the will, except to declare that it was lost in the fall. The reason of this is, no doubt, that the Westminster divines could not reconcile it in logic with the doctrine of the decrees. They did not comprehend what, through the progress of theological knowledge

since their day, is now generally admitted, that these are two great and co-ordinate truths, each of which rests on its own evidence, and neither of which should be made to limit the other, whilst the secret of their perfect harmony may be known only to God. Hence the vast development given to one of them was made, in opposition to human consciousness and the general tenor of Scripture, to negative the other, although they are of equal importance, and should be equally developed and emphasized. For whilst the doctrine of the decrees may have greater logical comprehension, it cannot surely have greater practical significance, than the freedom of the will, which includes the whole of man's responsibility to God.

But, beyond this, in the Westminster and other reformed confessions generally, the doctrine of the decrees is made the central and governing principle of the whole system. All the other doctrines are stated in their logical relations to this one, and from it they all take their distinctive forms and peculiar coloring; in fact, they are all made to centre in and revolve around it, as the planets around their central sun. Now, it may be conceded that logically the doctrine of the decrees is the true centre upon which all the others depend; but here, as in so many other instances of systematized religious thought, the logical and spiritual centres do not correspond. For, beyond a question at this day, the true, spiritual, vital and practical centre of the whole gospel scheme of salvation is the person and work, or mediation, of the Lord Jesus Christ. This, therefore, ought to stand as the central principle of everything that pretends to be a scheme of evangelical doctrine. All the other doctrines should be stated in their relations to this one; they should be made to centre in and revolve around it, as they do in the Scriptures themselves; and this would give to them all an entirely different development and coloring, and a vastly more vital and practical significance than they have in their present relations.

Moreover, every such scheme of evangelical doctrine ought certainly to contain a full and clear statement of the relation which the sacrifice of Christ bears to all human souls, whether of the elect or not, to which it is believed that there is not even an allusion in the whole Westminster confession. "Who is the Redeemer of God's elect?" The whole scheme of doctrine on this fundamental point is developed in answer to that one question. The urgent need of such a statement arises from the fact, that all ministers must stand on the ground of this general relation of the atonement to mankind-sinners when they preach the gospel of "Christ and Him crucified." For they have no message to the elect as such, because they cannot know who they are. Hence it is evident that this confession, as it now stands, does not provide them with any ground to stand upon from which they can tell the people what Christ, by His most holy and efficacious sacrifice, has done for them, nor for any but the elect, among whom none can reckon themselves until they have actually accepted Him as their Saviour. Thus, in strictness of logic, the gospel message and argument, that which was intended to be 'good news to all people,' is reduced to this: My friends, Christ died for some persons, I know not whom; therefore, you all ought to believe and put your trust in Him. Is there any convicting force in that sophism? If ministers should confine themselves within these limits, is it not evident that none would ever be saved under their preaching, except by misunderstanding it? In fact, those who swear in the *ipsissima verba* of the confession are thus commonly misunderstood. For they preach: My friends, Christ died for us; therefore, we ought to trust in Him as our Saviour: and the people, with the Bible in their hands, find that this is true of them, whereas it is held by the preacher to be true only of the elect. The author does not understand himself to differ from the great body of his brethren as to what this general relation of the atone-

ment is; for there are very few who do not hold that it must be such that Christ and His salvation can be freely offered to every individual in the words: My friend, Christ died for you—and that, without the mental reservation, provided you are one of the elect. But, in order to find authority for any such offer to individuals, it is undeniable that we must go out of the confession directly to the Bible itself.

In fine, this confession, as the organic law of those branches of the church which accept it, requires the insertion of a distinct article providing for its own revision and amendment, as the need comes to be felt, and prescribing a more facile method of reaching this object than any which is now practicable. For in consequence of this defect, the Presbyterian church in this country has suffered, for upwards of twenty years, the scandal of four or five hundred congregations with rotary elderships, without a shadow of constitutional authority, in palpable violation of the law on that subject, which still remains unrepealed, and which all the church officers are solemnly sworn to observe and maintain. And here again we have what is always the case with written constitutions which cannot be amended with adequate facility, namely, the currents of life and thought soon come to flow in other channels, and leave their prescribed courses empty and dry—the laws become a dead letter, with all the terrible demoralization which arises from the constant violation of the official oath to observe and maintain them. For no body of fallible men can prescribe laws that will govern these providential currents of thought and life for any great length of time, much less for all future generations. That is the prerogative of God alone, who foresees the end from the beginning, and such laws He has given us solely in His word. The Westminster divines emphatically disclaim all attempts to do anything of the kind in the words: "All synods and councils since the apostles' times, whether

general or particular, may err and many have erred; therefore, they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both." How much, then, are they misunderstood by those who cannot see that their work should ever require correction or revision!

But, in any movement which can be made to revise this or other reformed confessions, a question of immensely greater significance than that of their amendment is sure to be raised, namely, whether it will be wise to make any renewed attempt to include the whole body of gospel truth in a logical system as the church's confession of faith? For it is a well-ascertained principle, both in ecclesiastical and civil society, that organic or constitutional laws should be of a general and comprehensive character; and this surely must be the true idea of a creed, or confession of faith, to which all officials must give their sworn assent, and, as the matter is commonly understood and insisted upon, must bind themselves by the most solemn obligations never to teach nor to believe anything inconsistent with its statements. For by taking upon themselves such obligations, with respect to any merely human scheme of doctrine, men do pledge themselves, as we have seen, against all progress in Divine knowledge. If the usual subscription to the Westminster confession be strictly taken, it binds the subscribers never to make any such progress in advance of that to which the church had attained about two hundred and fifty years ago; and this, under penalty of being regarded and treated as false to their covenant vows, and of sacrificing their good standing in the church, their temporal support, and all their opportunities and prospects of usefulness.

Thus we see that the evils of such elaborate systems of theology, when solemnly adopted and held as confessions of faith, must be enormous, especially in their influence upon the ministry. For it seems evident that thoughtful and conscientious men, with deep convictions of human falli-

bility, and having before their eyes the wonderful progress which is made in science and industry, will shrink more and more from incurring such obligations, and from the office of the ministry in those communions which require it. Hence a constantly increasing difficulty in supplying the church with able and faithful preachers and pastors; and what is to be anticipated but that this sacred office will come to be occupied more and more by those who will not much care what they bind themselves to teach or to believe, provided it will give them a piece of bread? Hence, also, the candidates for the ministry now, almost universally, have to be educated at the expense of the church. This was not so formerly because the validity and sufficiency of these minute statements of doctrine had hardly begun to be questioned—the need of their revision and of re-statement had hardly begun to be felt. In those times, the pulpits of the church were voluntarily sought and filled by the ablest and most eloquent men. How different it is now appears from the fact, which is generally admitted, that the preaching of the gospel has lost much of its attraction and power, especially with the masses of mankind. For what moral power can it have when, as all men know, the preachers are not free to think for themselves, or otherwise than as fallible men like themselves thought centuries ago—so lightly prizing their freedom of thought that they do not hesitate to bind themselves by solemn covenant obligations never to advance in Divine knowledge beyond what has been already attained? Hence, moreover, it has come to pass that intelligent lay people, who are not under such stringent vows, but who are more or less free to think, are often far in advance of their ministers on the lines of religious thought. As a single example of this, the late reunion between the two great branches of the Presbyterian church in this country was brought about, as is well known, by lay pressure upon the ministers, from whom proceeded all the opposition which it encountered and overcame.

Another evil of these systems of theology held as confessions of faith is, that they constitute the great barriers and bulwarks which now separate the Lord's people into different denominations or sects, and prevent them from returning to that primitive unity of the church which, beyond dispute, was one of her most precious possessions as she came from the hands of the apostles. This makes it necessary that we should consider here the enormous evils of this state of division, or schism, which are such as the following:

1. Our modern sectarianism causes a frightful waste of the means, both material and moral, which God has entrusted to the church for the evangelization and salvation of the world. For it renders necessary a large number of missionary and benevolent boards, with their salaried officials and expensive accommodations, also, many different missionary establishments among the heathen, where much fewer would transact the same business, cover the same ground, and be far more efficient; and, perhaps, the greatest hindrance to the conversion of the heathen, at the present time, is the knowledge which they have thus gained that the church at home is divided into different sects which are more or less in conflict with each other. But the greatness of this waste is not so obvious in cities or large towns, where there is abundant room for a number of congregations, as it is in villages and country localities. For in every village of a thousand or fifteen hundred inhabitants—and such places are immensely numerous—where there is room for only one good church, and where no more can be well supported, there must now be five or six—Presbyterian, Episcopal, Methodist, Baptist, Congregational, and often there are several others—with their separate church buildings and accommodations. Now the expense of all these different organizations cannot be less than four or five times as great as would be required by one, which, also, in every other way, would be better for

the people and the cause. Here likewise the services of five or six ministers are required, where the work could be better done by one; in consequence of which, four or five other places, where there is an outcrying need for the preaching of the gospel, must be left destitute. Such is this waste, probably, in money alone, of more than is contributed by the whole church for all missionary and other benevolent objects. How can it be justified—how can it be in any way excusable—in the sight of God?

2. Also, our sectarianism enfeebles the preaching of the gospel, and dwarfs the faith and character of Christians. For, in the first place, the preachers in large numbers, are nearly starved, and, hence, in addition to the cause previously assigned, an inferior class of men are brought into the ministry. For a salary of four or five hundred dollars offers as strong an inducement to men of an inferior grade of ability and character as one of four or five thousand does to men of a superior grade. Secondly, the preachers, in order to confirm themselves and their people in adhering to their own particular sect, rather than to any other, are naturally led to develop and emphasize in their preaching those non-essentials in which the sects differ from each other, in place of those great essential and soul-saving truths in which they all agree; and it is these latter truths which convert sinners, and build up and perfect Christian character. Thirdly, each of the sects represents, most prominently at least, only one section or phase of the catholic faith—in some cases, hardly so much—whereas, in order to make whole Christians, it is indispensable that the whole of catholic truth should be set forth and dispensed in each particular congregation. For this reason, the Christian character. Thirdly, each of the sects represents, most prominently at least, only one section or phase of the catholic sectarian doctrine preached in the name of the Lord, can not help thinking that they could go across the street and hear a different and often a contrary one presented in

the same holy name with equal earnestness and ability; and thus their faith in what they hear from the pulpit is confused and enfeebled. Nor is this the worst of the case; for they naturally become so anxiously occupied in the difficult work of supporting their several organizations, in competition with each other, that they rush, with indecent haste, to secure every new family coming to reside in the place, and spare no efforts to make proselytes from rival congregations. Thus the sentiment of brotherly love, which is the Lord's own badge of discipleship, by which all men are to know who his true people are, perishes out of their hearts; and they, instead of living as the inoffensive sheep of the Good Shepherd, become like wolves which, in extreme hunger, prey upon each other. There is not the least exaggeration in all this, as is well known to all who have observed the workings of sectarianism in small communities.*

3. These divisions render it impossible for the church to hold up that sign of catholic unity, and of Christian character thereby perfected, upon which, being given, the Lord has covenanted that the world shall believe and be saved. For this is plainly the sense of that last prayer which He offered with and for His disciples before He suffered: "That they all may be one—as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they may be one in us—that the world may believe that thou hast sent me... That

* Sometime after the above was written the following paragraph appeared in the *New York Tribune* of Jan. 15, 1883:

There is a town in Iowa which has a population of 1300, and twelve distinct and separate church organizations, which a local paper says are not busy converting outsiders, but in trying to kill off each other. Life is made miserable to the unfortunate stranger who comes to that town. He is pounced upon by the emissaries of these organizations, and if he should be weak enough to yield to the blandishments of one, he is promptly ostracized by all the others. The aforesaid local paper seriously states that the business of the town is very much injured by this state of affairs. It would seem that if there was more religion and a little less church, it would be better all around.

they may be made perfect in one, that the world may know that thou hast sent me." Instead of this, 'the church, which is the body of Christ,' exists among us now in a dismembered state, its mangled limbs, torn from each other, and its life-blood, which is faith, pouring from its wounds in fatal streams. How, indeed, can it be otherwise than that the spiritual unity of the church, which is constituted by the indwelling in all her members of one and the same Spirit, should be marred, if not destroyed, by such a multitude of differing, and, to a certain extent, conflicting sects? Besides, this inward and spiritual unity must needs require an outward and visible sign, in order, first, that it should possess vitality, and, secondly, that it should be so manifested as to beget faith in the world that Christ is the Sent of God. For how can the people of the world, who are not able to discern spiritual things, be convinced that there is any such unity in the church, otherwise than by its going forth and manifesting itself externally to their senses? Thus understanding the above-cited words of the Lord, we see that it is for want of this sign that the world is not converted; and this is confirmed by the unparalleled success of the gospel in primitive times, before these sectarian divisions were known, and when the sin of schism, of which we seem to have lost all sense, was classed with rebellion, adultery and murder.

4. In fine, it has resulted from these sectarian divisions that effectual discipline for the maintenance of purity in the church is no longer possible. For whilst church censures in one sect have no validity or force in any of the others, suspension from ordinances, and even excommunication, cannot have much significance. Hence the barriers which the word of God sets up between the church and the world are broken down; one public opinion as to things lawful and unlawful—a common morality—governs both; and because the two are so nearly on a level, there is but little flow from one to the other. Here, also,

we have one reason why conversions are, comparatively, so much more numerous on the mission fields among the heathen than in the church at home.

Now, from these enormous evils the church of the first ages guarded herself by maintaining her catholic unity, and this, by limiting her creed to the fundamentals and essentials of Christian doctrine. For previous to the council of Nice in the fourth century, she certainly had no more extended or particular doctrinal symbol than that which, for reasons which we must here endeavor to elucidate, has commonly been called " the Apostles' Creed."

We observe, then, that there are certain facts and historical statements concerning this ancient and venerable symbol for which we are obliged to render some rational account. The first of these is its extreme brevity ; for it contains, at most, only sixteen specifications, which are so well known that they need not be reproduced here. The second is its indefiniteness, or freedom from precise definitions of doctrine. For it sets forth the fundamentals of the Christian faith concretely, even vaguely, in the form, " I believe *in* " the facts and truths thus indefinitely stated, and not in the form, I believe *that* these things are precisely thus and so : " I believe in the communion of saints." The third is, that it appears in all the earliest Christian authors as the same in substance, though in slightly variant forms—the variations being, for the most part, unimportant, with the marked exception, that the Lord's descent into Hades does not appear in it until sometime in the sixth century. The fourth is, that, about the close of the third century, it settled in the form in which we now have it, with the above exception. The fifth and last of these facts is, that the creed, from the earliest date, was ascribed to the apostles. Thus Rufinus, a voluminous and learned author of the fourth century, in his *Explanation of the Apostles' Creed*, writes as follows ; " The apostles of the Lord, when about to

separate to carry the gospel throughout the world, being met together, and filled with the Holy Ghost, composed this compend of what they were to preach, each one contributing his share to the composition, which they resolved to give as a rule of faith to those who should believe." This undoubtedly expresses the general belief of his times, and how much of it rests on ground which will bear modern criticism we shall soon see. Tertullian, also, a brilliant and powerful writer, at the close of the second century, recites the most important particulars of the creed, and states that it "is the one only rule of faith, which admits of no change or alteration, and which has prevailed in the church from the beginning of the gospel." But the earliest mention of this symbol is in the latter half of the second century by Irenæus, who was instructed by the illustrious martyr Polycarp, pastor of the church in Smyrna,who himself was a disciple of the apostle John. His words are as follows: "The church, though it be dispersed over all the world, from one end of the earth to the other, has received from the apostles and their disciples the belief in one God, the Father Almighty"—and so he proceeds to recite the most important particulars of the creed as we now have it. These are the facts of which we have now to render a rational account.

In the first place, then, it is sufficiently evident that, whilst the apostles lived and governed the church, the doctrinal and other differences which arose among their converts would be submitted to them, as the inspired and Divinely authorized teachers and expounders of the Christian faith, and that their definitive sentences would be received by all good Christians as authoritative and final. We have an example of such a reference and decision in the Acts of the Apostles, in the first council, which was called at Jerusalem, to determine differences of opinion with respect to the obligation and observance of the Mosaic law, which had arisen in the church at Antioch on the

Orontes, and which agitated many other Christian communities. But after the apostles had departed out of this life, similar differences of opinion must have continued to arise, as we know on historical evidence that they did; for they belong to human nature, and are inseparable from the different degrees of natural ability, culture and spiritual enlightenment by which men are necessarily distinguished, and in consequence of which they cannot help seeing the same things in various lights, and from different points of view. To eradicate these differences, therefore, is impossible; and if it could be accomplished, that, no doubt, would be fatal to human progress, which is always the resultant of interaction between diverse forces. Unity in diversity, not uniformity, is the true Scriptural law of spiritual, as it is of all organic life, and upon it depends the highest perfection of being. God himself is a Trinity of different personalities in the unity of one substance. Absolute and changeless uniformity is death. Consequently, when the authority of the apostles could no longer be appealed to, there must have arisen in all the churches which they founded a question as to the limits within which these differences of opinion could, and beyond which they could not be tolerated, without detriment to the unity and integrity of the faith and of the church. But that question necessarily involved another, namely, what were the fundamentals and essentials of Christian doctrine? For self-evidently fundamental differences could not, whilst others might, and ought to be allowed, not only in the church catholic, but also in each particular congregation. How was this latter question to be solved? There was but one way for all the churches, and this was so obvious that none of them could possibly miss it. For they could not fail to ask among themselves, what were the doctrinal terms of communion prescribed to us by our apostle who founded our church, and upon confession of which he received us to baptism and church-membership?

For he must have known what were the essentials of the Christian faith, and the belief of these he must have required of us when he admitted us into the church. Then, as they remembered these apostolic statements of the fundamental doctrines, they threw them together, or symbolized them—for that is the meaning of the word—in a form of confession, which became the creed of that church. Having now solved this question by apostolic authority, they could find no difficulty in the previous one. For their apostle must have tolerated all differences which were not inconsistent with his own doctrinal terms of communion; and what better could they hope to do than to follow his example? Thus we see, beyond all reasonable doubt, how it came to pass that, about the close of the first century, a creed substantially the same was formed and established in every particular church throughout the Christian world; as, also, on what unimpeachable grounds it was universally called "the Apostles' Creed," as having virtually, if not in form, the sanction of their authority.

This creed, however, having originated in this way, could not be at first precisely the same in all the churches; there would be, as we know that there were, unimportant variations. For, in the first place, the apostles themselves, though, or rather because they were plenarily inspired, wisely adapted themselves to circumstances, and can hardly be supposed to have prescribed their terms of communion everywhere in precisely the same form of words. St. Paul, in founding different churches, may have embodied and expressed the fundamental truths of the gospel in different expressions, as he does in his epistles; whilst St. Peter and St. John can hardly be supposed to have employed the same as those of St. Paul, or of each other—the characters of the men and their extant writings render this altogether improbable. Secondly, the terms actually employed by the apostles would not naturally be remembered in all the churches precisely alike, or with equal

accuracy. From these and perhaps other causes, some unimportant variations in the creed, such as those which it manifested, were inevitable. But as soon as they began to be noticed, a general comparison of the various forms in the several churches would naturally follow, whereby the differences would be, as they finally were, eliminated. Thus it was, in all probability, that, with the exception of the descent into Hades, which cannot be ascribed to the apostles, the creed settled in its present form.

Its brevity and indefiniteness are the only facts which remain to be rationally accounted for; and it would seem that these are not the least convincing proofs of its apostolic origin, in the sense which has been explained. For, as to its brevity, it is enough to say, that it contains all the fundamentals and essentials of the Christian faith, as understood by the apostles, and evinces that, in their idea of a church-creed, to these it should be limited. For they knew better than any since have ever known that, in all non-essentials, where there was room for true Christians to differ, they ought to be left free to differ; that such differences were no just cause for separation or schism; that they were essential to human development and progress; and that all creeds and confessions which should prohibit them would be inconsistent with the liberty of the children of God. And as to its indefiniteness, or freedom from precise definitions of doctrine, in this respect it conforms to the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ more perfectly than any other document ever did. For He knew, and His inspired apostles knew, what was entirely lost sight of in subsequent ages, and has not yet been recovered by the church, that precise definitions of spiritual things were limitations of the illimitable, and that these things must appear very differently to persons in different degrees of spiritual enlightenment and otherwise distinguished from each other. It is in view of such necessary differences that the Apostles' Creed presents the great facts and truths

of the Christian religion without such limitations, in order that every one may see in them as much as he brings capacity for seeing; that, however much he may grow, he may never outgrow it; and that it may be, as it is, no less milk for babes than food for the strongest and most developed spiritual natures. For the correction of all minor errors, such as did not involve a denial of any of these facts as truths, as thus concretely stated, the apostles and the church as they left it, relied, not upon creeds nor confessions, but upon faithful pastoral instruction and admonition, upon the communion of the saints with each other, upon the development and increase of light and life in the individual soul—above all, upon the Lord's promise and gift of His Holy Spirit to guide His people into all truth, so that none of them should ever be left to go fatally astray.

In such considerations as these—of the necessary brevity of constitutional and organic laws, of the evils of our present sectarianism, as inseparable from the great bulk and extent of the reformed confessions, of their many defects, as brought to light by the progress of the last three hundred years—we find all-sufficient reasons for a thorough revision of these antiquated documents, and for limiting them to something like the brevity and simplicity of the Apostles' Creed. Indeed, when we consider how all the above evils were guarded against by the apostles themselves, and by the church of the first ages, it seems as if we could not do better than to return to this only creed for which apostolic authority can be claimed, in which all Christians throughout the whole world are still fully agreed, and with which inscribed upon her banners the apostolic church fought and conquered in the great battle of the ages, when the ancient towers and mighty bulwarks of paganism went down in flaming ruins before the unity and strength of her faith and the quenchless fervor of her zeal.

The only objection to all this which we ever hear is, that

errors are now so rife that we have greater need of extended exhibitions and precise definitions of doctrine than the first Christians had. The objection has not a particle of force, for no one acquainted with church history can deny, that there were as many and as dangerous heresies then as there are now; and it is doubtful whether we have a single one which was then unknown. Even those of modern physical science and speculation, which seem now to give most disturbance, are all found in the philosophical poem of Lucretius on *The Nature of Things*. And when it was attempted to suppress theological error by departing from the method of the apostles, and adopting more rigorous definitions, as in the Council of Nice, in the fourth century, the attempt proved unsuccessful; for in spite of the Nicene creed, Arianism, against which it was formulated, continued to flourish for centuries, and became, at one time, the most general belief in the Christian world. It perished at last, not by the force of creeds or confessions, but from its own essential falsity, and because the truth is great and must ultimately prevail.

The author has now indicated the principal reasons for which he, as one of the least of the sacramental host, has long felt a pressing need for a revision of the doctrinal standards of his own, and of the other branches of the reformed church; and it is a great relief to him thus to open his heart to his brethren in the Lord. For he has been much misrepresented or misunderstood, and has long desired to explain the meaning of his own acceptance of the Westminster confession, "as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." In personal explanation, then, he takes the words, "system of doctrine," in the sense of body of doctrine; and he can truly declare that there is hardly a statement in the whole book, and certainly none of any great importance, which, taken by itself, he does not cordially receive. But the logical connections in which these statements stand, which have been

supplied by men fallible like himself, are no part of his faith; and, in fact, he believes a great deal more than is even hinted at in the book. As for saying that it contains the best scheme of doctrine which could be drawn from the word of God—one that can have no need of revision as the church makes progress towards the millennial glory —this he has never meant to say, and this, with respect to any merely human scheme of doctrine, he never will say, so help him God in his utmost need!

But all personal considerations sink into insignificance compared with the bearings of this great question upon the prosperity and life of the church. For if there is to be progress, there must be change; and progress there will be, as there always has been—we have seen that it is the grand prophecy of the Scriptures. Change, then, will surely come, and all the more violently, the more it is resisted where it ought to be welcomed. There are worse things than change, and one of them is death, to which no change comes. Whilst, therefore, we hold fast, with the wisdom of reverence, to everything good which we have inherited from preceding generations, let us not cling to their errors and imperfections, nor reject the infinitely better things which the great future has in store for us. If our forefathers had committed this inexcusable blunder, we should have inherited from them nothing of any value; and even the priceless legacy of the reformation would have been lost to the church and the world.

XIX

RELIGION AND POLITICS

The kingdoms of the world are become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ... Upon His head are many crowns... And He hath on His vesture and on His thigh a name written, King of Kings, and Lord of lords... Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth: kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little.

We have seen, in a previous study, that progress is a fundamental law of human society. Indeed, the faith and hope of it are interwoven with the very fibres of parental affection. For we easily persuade ourselves that our children will come to honor, and that we shall be comforted for our own errors and failures by their better success in life; as in the case of a certain father, who called his son into his presence on the day he came of age, and said: "My son, you are no longer a child, you are now a man, and, from this day, you will have no master but God. God and your country now call you to liberty and to duty. I wish you to remember, my son, that it has ever been the aim of your father to be a man, and to act a man's part in life. His honor is now committed to your hands: you will not betray nor tarnish it." To the young man that was all he said, but, as he turned away, he softly added: "It is an honest lad, he will not discredit his name, he will do better than his father has done."

Here, now, we have the indestructible germ of faith and hope for that physical, mental and moral development and progress of the human race of which all history, when rightly understood, is the crowning proof. It is true, in-

deed, as every thinking man must be well aware, that much of that which is called by the name of progress is mis-called. If the destinies of mankind were in the hands of many who vociferate this word, but who are only camp-followers to the army, intent on plunder, no real victory could ever be achieved, but organized society would soon be dissolved, and the world engulfed in perdition. Notwithstanding, from the times of the old Hebrew seers, in whose sublime utterances it found its first and most assured predictions, progress has ever been the faith of all great and good men. It is, in fact, the light of human life, without which life itself would be intolerable. We cannot believe in a permanently retrograde movement. The deep and fervent aspirations of our hearts, and the faithful labors of our hands, are not doomed to unfruitfulness and final disappointment. Succeeding generations do enter into the labors, and profit by the experience of those which have preceded them. Human reason is a nobler endowment than the instinct of the beaver.

A little attention, however, to the phenomena of historical development reveals the striking fact, that this progress is hardly ever in a direct line, but mostly in a zig-zag movement, like that of a ship beating to windward. Thus, from the experience of the practical evils resulting from any accepted social philosophy, or prevailing solution of the great problems of life, human thought reacts, and shoots far over into the opposite extreme. When the evils of this extreme have made themselves generally felt, and others still more grievous are threatening, a similar reaction sets in, and again the word is passed, Breakers ahead, about ship, helm hard down! Then we come up into the wind, and, if we do not miss stays, and fall off on rocks or quicksands, we go about, and lie over on the other tack. But, head as close to the wind as we can, we soon find ourselves, not, indeed, in the same, but

in a similar extreme to the former one. In the meantime, a certain progress has been made, yet by no means so great as he imagines who looks only at the motion of the vessel through the water, but does not lift his eyes to the guiding constellations of heaven.

Sometimes, when the wind is dead ahead, and the channel is narrow, as the case has been in France for the last two hundred years, these oblique courses are very short. For, in that country we have under Louis XIV the apotheosis of despotism, then the evils of that extreme, the subsequent reaction, and the subversion of that ancient and renowned monarchy. Following upon this, we have the opposite extreme of Jacobinism, the reign of terror, a similar reaction against its intolerable evils, and the consequent overthrow of the first republic. Next comes the military throne of the first Napoleon, together with the sorrows of France depopulated by his incessant wars, and of Paris occupied by the allied armies, then the banishment of the emperor, and the restoration of the ancient dynasty, with most of its obsolete traditions. Hence another reaction towards republicanism, the second expulsion of the Bourbons, the reign of the citizen king, his flight, and the second republic; against which, again, reaction set in, not so much, as it would seem, from any extremes actually reached, or evils actually experienced, as from those which were apprehended as impending and inevitable. For, during the brief period of the second republic, the socialistic ideas had made such rapid advances as to threaten the rights of property, the integrity of the nation, and civilization itself. This was well understood at the time by the leading minds in France. Hence Cavaignac himself, that staunch and incorruptible republican, is known to have declared that, although he would not forfeit his own consistency, yet, if Louis Napoleon, or any other capable man, should put himself at the head of a reactionary movement, he, Cavaignac, would not draw his sword in defence

of republican ideas; for he could not disguise from himself that a change was necessary in order to save society. This was the secret of that great man's virtual acquiescence, so inexplicable to many, in the *coup d' état* which established the second empire. But this could not last, for its enormous and shameless corruptions, which led to the Franco-Prussian war, with all its disastrous consequences, caused an overwhelming reaction, which resulted in its overthrow, and in the establishment of the present third republic; under which, the socialistic and radical deeps even now are heaving with muttered thunder, and threatening its destruction, so that the restoration of a more conservative government may again become necessary. But, now, if we compare society under this third republic with that under the first Napoleon, and, still farther back, with that under the old monarchy, it will be quite evident that the resultant of all these actions and reactions has been a true and living progress.

We find the most sharply defined and typical form of this whole procedure in France, because one of the most striking traits of Frenchmen is that they are idealistic and logical; they abound in ideas, and they develop and apply their social and political theories, as if they were absolute, even to the most extreme results of which they are capable. Your true Gaul 'follows his logic down Niagara.' Hence the rapidity with which he runs through these historic periods, and the frequency, strength and violence of his reactionary movements. Yet such, in all essential elements, has been the history of mankind. For if it be objected, as we sometimes hear it, that French nature is not human nature, and such things are seen only in France, we are not to attribute the least significance to this, or similar strokes of wit, for their wit is all that gives them currency. Human nature is everywhere one and the same thing; and we meet similar phenomena in Greek, Roman, and, as we shall see hereafter, even in Jewish history. In

fact, through all past time, wherever any life or movement has been manifested, this progress by action and reaction has been going on in more or less striking forms, with longer or shorter reaches of thought, according to the circumstances and peculiarities of the several peoples and varieties of the human species.

The reason of it is not far to seek. For the life of man consists, for the most part, in the development under logical forms, and in the external realization, of intellectual conceptions, ideas, principles: 'ideas govern the world.' Facts, history, *res gestæ*, are the phenomena and the body of which thought is the soul and the law. 'History is crystallized thought.' Not that such ideas or principles are first apprehended by the mind; on the contrary, facts are first in the field. Some leader of men becomes deeply conscious of a common want, and thereupon immediately takes action to supply it. In order now to justify such action, and to induce others to share with him in its responsibility and benefits, reflection is brought to bear upon it, and the principle which it contains is abstracted and defined. This principle now enters into a course of logical development; its contents are evolved out of it, and applied in various directions according to circumstances. Thus it passes into history. In so far as any such idea is both true and fruitful, the people in whose history it is realized are animated by a vigorous and flourishing life. The time during which it continues to supply impulse and energy, norm and corrective, to their activities, is marked as one of their historic periods; and such periods are of longer or shorter duration, and more or less rich in important events, according to the peculiarities of the people, and to the truth and fruitfulness of the ideas by which they are inspired and governed.

Thus all great events in the world are the movements of thought in evolution and application or realization. And wonderful it is to see with what rigorous logical procedure

such developments march. For, although each individual may be capable of but little thought, and that little may often wander and load itself with inconsequences, yet, as in orchestral music, the discords of unskilful performers become assimilated, and absorbed in the full tide of prevailing harmony, so, in these great movements of history, the errors in reasoning of individual minds are neutralized by each other, or they are taken up and borne along in the vast sweep and volume of national thought, which consequently follows, in the main, a logical development.

But, in order more fully to comprehend why such movements cannot run on in the same direction forever, we must here take into consideration, that the truth is infinite, and the capacities of the human mind are finite. In consequence of this, the ideas which are developed in history can never be absolute. In so far even as they are true, they are but glimpses into the infinite, and are liable to become exhausted of their contents, so that, torture them as we may, they will yield no more consequences which are capable of being realized ; in which case, they cease to inspire the life and energies of the people, and naturally give place to other ideas, which turn the current of history. Besides, no one idea, however great and fruitful, can be adequate at any time to fill out the whole circumference of human life, which is manifold and many-sided. The life of each individual, much more that of a whole people, consists in the development and realization of many ideas, which have complex relations with each other, are often in conflict, and yield consequences which never can be foreseen. It is only through actual development in life that the contents of any great historical principle ever come to be fully known. Hence, when such principles continue to be fruitful for a long time, they are liable to be pushed on to applications which not only clash with each other, but are also pernicious in themselves. For there is no principle capable of development and realization which will

not yield, by perfectly legitimate processes, extreme results which sound practical wisdom will steadfastly refuse to adopt and apply. Every such principle, however incontrovertible it may be when abstractly stated, and however beneficial most of its legitimate consequences may be, is necessarily dependent, to a great extent, upon circumstances, and hence, in application, it often requires to be severely limited.

Now, where this is ill understood or neglected—where the people do not stop to apply these necessary limitations, but push on the great ideas which inspire and give direction to their energies to extreme consequences, these become productive of intolerable evils, when reaction is sure to set in against them, the ship goes about, and lies over on the other tack. And, as we have found the most striking instances of this procedure in French history, so the English, above all whom we know, whether in ancient or modern times, seem to have the power of limiting ideas, and of arresting their extreme consequences. For they are not a people devoted to theories. The most remarkable trait of their national mind is common sense. They understand the necessity of checks and balances in every human arrangement. Hence those long reaches through which their historic periods run, and the permanency of their political and social institutions. Hence, also, that maxim of practical wisdom, which is doubtless of English origin: 'It may be very good in theory, but it will not hold in practice,' and which, however ridiculed by sciolists, is both sound in itself, and of extensive application. For, as we here see, the wisdom and safety of any act or course of action does not wholly rest upon its being a legitimate consequence of any received, and, in the main, sound principle; but, in order to a safe practical judgment, each separate result of our guiding principles must be brought to the test of other ideas which may have a bearing upon it, as, also, to that of experience and common sense.

In the light of these principles and laws of human development, we may endeavor, in considering THE RELATIONS BETWEEN RELIGION AND POLITICS UNDER AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS, to determine through what stage, whether of healthful progress, or of extreme results, we are now moving in the realization of the grand ideas which inspire and govern our life.

But, here, it is necessary to ascend to the fountain-head of all that can properly be called modern history. For the great historic period through which civilized society is now passing began, in so far as that which necessarily belongs to the organic whole of universal history can be said to have had a beginning, with the reformation in the sixteenth century. Martin Luther, when he rose up against the authority of the papacy, acted from the impulse of a principle which, abstracted from his action and properly defined, we must characterize as that of INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY, the right of private judgment, the responsibility of the individual conscience to God alone, individualism. This mighty truth, this vast and fruitful idea, by the strength with which it actuated Luther, and by his agency in opening to it a career of development in the world, was that which made him truly and properly an epoch making man. For, with all reverence for the other great reformers, especially, for Calvin, Melancthon and Knox, nor can we leave out Erasmus, their relation to Luther seems to have been somewhat similar to that of La Place to Sir Isaac Newton.

Now, this principle, like all other ideas which have exerted a regenerating and transforming influence upon the world, had its birth in a fact of religion, and, consequently, it was first applied to doctrinal, moral and church reforms. But, self-evidently, it could not be limited to them, and, in fact, the history, religious, political and social, of all the Protestant peoples to the present hour has chiefly consisted of the progressive development, and more and more exten-

sive realization of this idea. For hence we have the reformed religion—all that this word signifies. Hence came Oliver Cromwell, the English, American and French revolutions, with all their fruits and consequences in modern history. Hence, also, we have all our free institutions—our free thought, free press, free schools, free Bible, and free church—our freedom of scientific investigation and publication—together with that riches and bloom of philosophy, literature and science, especially that stupendous development of the physical sciences in application to the industrial arts, in the midst of which it is our happiness to live. For the immeasurable superiority in all these particulars of Protestant to papal countries—except France alone, emancipated to a great extent from papal domination by the revolution—is evidence enough that they spring from the germinal principle of the Protestant reformation.

But it was on the American continent, in this new and vast country, and by reason of the antecedents, character and objects of the first settlers, that this great religious, political and social principle found a wider and more favorable sphere—its true and proper home. Consequently, American history, more than any other, consists of its ever progressive development and realization. For it has given us that individualism of character, that self-reliance, daring enterprise and abounding energy, which, in religion, politics and business, are so strikingly characteristic of the American mind. Hence, also, we derive our prevailing mode or tendency to question, investigate, discuss and criticise, rather than to believe. For in all departments of thought and life—in science, art and philosophy—in theology, religion and morals—in the family, the state and the church—there seems to be nothing too great or too small, too high or too low, too sacred or too profane, for our individual criticism. This principle places us also in constant and strenuous resistance to the authority of tradi-

tion and to prescriptive rights. Indeed, it can hardly be doubted but that we have already attained to extreme and pernicious results in this direction; nor would it be surprising if those who shall come after us should proceed still further in the development of the idea, and reject much of what we still retain of our precious inheritance from the past. Certain it is, that if this habit of mind should continue to grow upon us, as it is sure to do if it be not powerfully checked, it will, in time, lead us to the rejection of many important truths, sound maxims and wholesome customs, which as yet are hardly ever questioned.

The application of this principle in matters of religion has given us our religious liberty, with all its unspeakable blessings. Hence, also, we have that vast multitude of religious sects or denominations, with all their evils, by which Protestant Christianity is characterized, in distinction from the outward and formal unity of Romanism. And here it would seem that we have already reached very extreme results, which exert no little influence to undermine and subvert the faith of the people. Nor is there anything in the principle from which all these sects have sprung to restrain it from continuing to multiply them. Within the present generation, it has rent in twain the Methodist, Presbyterian and Protestant Episcopal branches of the church, and given us a number of new denominations, to say nothing of Mormonism, or of innumerable spiritualist circles. It is still in full course of development, and continues to threaten other communions. Where will it naturally stop? Let it run on to the last extremes of which it is capable in logic, and it must subvert the very idea of catholic unity, and make each individual his own church. All that is necessary to ensure this result is, that the same mental processes should continue to repeat themselves. Here, then, the principle from which they spring requires to be limited, of which, indeed, we are not without encouraging signs, such as that

of the late re-union of two branches of the Presbyterian church. The last and now the only hope of Romanism in the world lies in the possibility that Protestantism may not have the wisdom to apply these limitations in time to save the faith of the people.

In civil society, this principle has given us our free institutions, with all their innumerable blessings. As the right of self-government, it has originated and sustains our national, state, county, township, and municipal organizations. Hence the whole country is divided and subdivided again and again, in order that local self-government may be the more perfectly realized. But it is evident that the idea admits of still further development in the political separation of the northern and southern, eastern and western portions of the country from each other, and of each state from all the others, and in their setting up for themselves as so many independent sovereignties. To this result the late rebellion would inevitably have led, if it had not been suppressed. Nay, beyond all this, the remotest consequences of this principle would displace the very idea of states and sovereignties, and would constitute each individual the supreme law and sole arbiter of his own life and conduct. But this is anarchy, which is by no means an impossible state of society; for it seems to have been the actual condition of the Israelites at the close of that historic period which is covered by the Book of Judges, when "there was no king in Israel, and every man did that which was right in his own eyes;" and what a state of political and social disorganization these words were intended to represent is evident from that horrid affair of the Levite's concubine, in which one whole tribe was almost exterminated, and which closes in that stormy period. Hence the uncontrollable reaction which followed, and the establishment of monarchy on the ruins of their former liberties, in order to save society. Nor is there any other way to escape precisely similar results in American

society but by the severe limitation of the now dominant principle of individualism.

We come now to consider the application of this principle in that large sphere where religion, morals and politics are inseparably interwoven with each other. Here, then, we may observe, first, that there is nothing in it opposed to polygamy, or to restrain any man from marrying as many women as he can induce to become his wives. Hence we have lived to see United States officials exercising, in a perfectly valid form, all the functions of territorial government, with harems of women around them more numerous than that of the Grand Turk. This is a significant fact, well worthy of being comprehended in connection with the principle from which it originates, and by which it is claimed to be justified. Hence, also, our communities of free-lovers, and their impurity, together with the facility and enormous multiplication of divorces among us.* For where all parties freely consent to such arrangements, the idea of individual liberty is more perfectly realized. Here, again, therefore, the principle of which such abominations are the logical consequences requires to be limited.

Moreover, the principle itself admits of an easy translation into the received formula, that the governmental powers are derived from the consent or concessions of the governed. But it is self-evident that men cannot concede to government any rights or powers which they do not themselves possess; and no man is possessed of the right

* From court records in several of the New England States, we find that in 1878, there were granted in Rhode Island 196 divorces—in 1880, 246; in Maine, 1878, 478—1880, 510; in Massachusetts, 1878, 600. During the three years between 1866 and 1869, in Massachusetts, there were granted 1352 divorces; and between 1876 and 1879, 2255—an increase of 903. In this last state, also, the ratio of divorces to marriages has risen in twenty years from one in fifty-one to one in twenty one. It is probable that this ratio of increase is not less in other states, and that in some it is much greater. Such in this particular are the extreme consequences of the principle of individual liberty in connection with the secularization of marriage.

to take away his own life for any cause, or in any circumstances. Consequently they cannot concede to, nor vest in their governments the authority or power to deprive them of their lives, so that, under this formula, governments have no legitimate power to inflict the death-penalty, and capital punishment becomes judicial murder. Here, then, we are enabled to comprehend those restless agitations against the exercise of this power which we constantly experience, which have already excluded it from the penal code of several of our states, which render it almost impossible to obtain capital conviction in others, and which, it is easy to foresee, must ultimately abolish it altogether, if the principle from which such consequences flow be not severely limited.

But the most striking and significant example of extreme results in this sphere of the development of the principle is found in the attempts which are made to secularize the state, and to eliminate all religious and moral character and aims from politics—attempts which have proved largely, if not altogether successful. For this principle has so far moulded our fundamental and organic laws that they claim to be absolutely neutral and indifferent with respect to all the various religions of mankind. In order that every individual may be not only free, but wholly unbiassed in his religious belief and opinions by governmental influence, the constitution of the United States has rigorously abstained from all recognition of the Christian religion. It nowhere mentions the name, or recognizes the being of God, unless it be in its date, to which, of course, no significance can be attached. Also, it prescribes and ordains that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or public trust." Consequently it cannot and does not require any official oath in the name of God. What is called the oath of the president elect, and which serves as a model for all others, is prescribed in these

words, "I solemnly swear or affirm," so that he is left free to swear by nothing at all, and thus to leave out, not only all recognition of God, but also the very essence of an oath. Whenever the name of God is introduced in any transaction under the constitution of the United States, or of any particular State, in any department of government, executive, legislative, or judicial, it is purely optional. The avowed object, and, in large measure, the practical effect of all this is the secularization of civil government, and its neutrality in religion, so that no governmental influence shall be exerted for or against any form of religious belief.

All this is fully admitted and strenuously defended by the commentators on the constitution of the United States. Says one of them: "It has been objected by some against the constitution, that it makes no mention of religion, contains no recognition of the existence and providence of God... But there were other reasons why the introduction of religion would have been unseasonable, if not improper. The constitution was intended exclusively for civil purposes, and religion could not be regularly mentioned. The difference among the various sects of Christians is such that, in an instrument where all are entitled to equal consideration, it would have been difficult to use words in which all could cordially join... The purity of religion is best preserved by keeping it separate from government... It was impossible to introduce into the constitution even an expression of gratitude to the Almighty for the formation of the present government"!! Such are the views of the commentators, in which they manifest a conspicuous zeal for maintaining the purity of religion "by keeping it separate from government"; but, unfortunately, they do not inform us what is to preserve the purity of government, after it has thus repudiated all religious character and objects, and sequestered itself as much as possible from that which is the only salt of the earth. It were "devoutly

to be wished" that some eminent publicist of the secular school would rise and speak to this point.

It is true, however, that some of our state constitutions have in their preambles recognitions of God and of the Christian religion. But where this is the case, they have no authority, and are, in fact, invalidated by the paramount authority of the national constitution, which abrogates everything in the constitutions and laws of the states which is inconsistent with itself. Others of these instruments contain provisions of positive hostility to Christianity, which are also invalidated by the neutral character of the paramount law. The constitution of the state of New York, however, in everything except the preamble, is an admirable example of perfect religious neutrality, and the more significant from the greatness and typical character of the state and people. For it guarantees the largest liberty to all persons with respect to all religions, "without distinction or preference;" and, that the original intent of this expression was to place all other religions, and all the infidelities of the world, upon an exact level with Christianity before the government, we have the best possible evidence. For, being well acquainted with the eminent and accomplished gentleman to whom chiefly that instrument owes its present form, and happening to meet him soon after its adoption, we took occasion to say: "You, sir, have succeeded in doing what probably no other man could have done. For, having yourself been born and brought up and moulded in all your faculties under the influence of Christianity, you have given us a constitution for the government of a great Christian people, which covers a vast extent and variety of topics, and yet from which, in no single word or form of expression, could it even be inferred that such a fact as the Christian religion had ever existed." "Ah," he replied, "how well you have understood it, for that was just what we intended to do." Yet was he anything but an irreligious person;

on the contrary, he was a regular attendant and a liberal supporter of an evangelical church. But such was his theory of civil government. A Christian person, even a Christian family, he could understand and appreciate; but a Christian state or nation was, in his mind, something altogether inconsistent with the religious liberty of the individual.

The further development of this principle in the sphere of religion and politics must lead, by necessary consequence, to the abrogation of all our existing laws for the protection of the Christian Sabbath, for the punishment of blasphemy, and the like; as, also, to the banishment from our legislative bodies, army and navy, of all observances of the Sabbath, chaplaincies and religious services, and of all recognition of God and the Christian religion from the messages of our chief magistrates, both state and national. Even the executive appointment or recommendation of thanksgiving and fast days must cease, because, being governmental acts with distinction and preference in matters of religious belief, and exerting a governmental influence in favor of Christianity, and against infidelity, scepticism and all non-Christian religions, they are inconsistent with the spirit and letter of our fundamental and organic law. Hence the agitation, on the part of rigorous theorists, which we encounter from time to time, calling for their abolition. In fact, all such observances are the debris of a former and now obsolete idea, that of a Christian state, which are still tolerated among us—the laws against Sabbath desecration and blasphemy being mostly a dead letter —because their religious character and influence are so ill-defined and ineffectual, and because our civil institutions are as yet imperfectly purified from religion.

In addition to all this, the influence of this jealous neutrality of our national and state governments, with respect to religion, upon our public men, political parties and political life, in general, seems to be evil in the extreme. For it is evi-

dent that a government can be administered according to its true intents and aims only by men who are in full sympathy with its character: and, since our constitutions do thus repudiate all influences which can bias the minds of individuals for or against any religious belief, they cannot but act, in a powerful though subtle manner, to repel from their offices of trust, and from political organizations under them, such men as have any religious character, and to attract those who have as few religious scruples as possible. Accordingly, it has been observed that our best and ablest men are not in public life, and that our chief magistrates have hardly ever been professed Christians. Even when favorably disposed to religion, they have commonly held themselves aloof from church-membership until their retirement from office. The like is true, with distinguished exceptions, of our legislators, judges, aspirants to official positions, and public men in general. Here, also, we find the true source of that almost total banishment of religious and moral ideas, aims and restraints from politics which now prevails among us, and of that prodigious, ever-increasing political corruption which already perplexes and appals the nation. For it is impossible thus to exclude religion from any sphere of human life without making it an uncongenial sphere for the exercise of moral principle. But, forsooth, "the purity of religion is best preserved by keeping it separate from government!" Now this is a two-edged sword. For precisely in the degree in which religion is thus sequestered from the corrupting influence of government and politics, are politics and government left without the purifying influence of religion: and, being thus deprived of the only "salt of the earth," they naturally fall into irredeemable demoralization and corruption, such as that with which we are now afflicted. For if we believe only half of what the two great political parties say of each other, we must believe that corruption in them is the rule, rather than the exception. What now is the

moral condition of the governments of our large cities? And who does not know that our legislation is bought and sold, with scarcely an attempt at disguise or concealment? In the words of one of the leading secular journals of the day: "The simple fact is, and it is infatuation to shut our eyes to it, that venality in our legislative halls is fast becoming, if it has not already become, our supreme evil, the worst scandal and the direst danger of our institutions, the very leprosy of our body politic. The little regard that has been paid to it has been the greatest of mistakes. There is no party end or political principle that can compare in importance with the duty of putting an end to this profligate legislation. No political measures, whatever they are, ought to stand for an instant when used as screens for the ravages of this evil."

These are some of the fruits of state-secularization, of our sequestration of government from religious and moral aims and influences; and the idea is as yet but imperfectly realized—it is in full career of development up to the present hour. When it shall have reached its last terms; when all appeal to religious motives in politics shall have come to be regarded as illegitimate as is now the appeal to political motives in religion; when the last vestige of moral character and aims shall have been eliminated from all our governmental institutions; what, then, is to become of these institutions, which, as all men acknowledge, are founded on the public virtue of the people? For, in consequence of this foundation, they cannot stand as great an amount of corruption as other forms of government. This is evident from the fact, that, however corrupt a monarchy or despotism may become, it is always the interest of the ruler to be served in the most honest and capable manner, and, hence, he naturally spares no pains to secure, in all his subordinate offices, able and faithful servants. But now that the offices under our government have come to be regarded, not as services, or

public trusts, but as rewards, and positions of emolument, to be bought with money, there is no price which corrupt men cannot afford to pay for them, because they can always reimburse themselves, and often make their fortunes, by the plunder of the public. Also, politics occupy a much larger sphere of human life in this country than in any other. For here every man is not only a citizen, but also a voter, and is eligible to the highest and most lucrative office; hence he naturally becomes a politician. Take out of American life all that can properly be characterized as political, and what a chasm would be left! In consequence of this, political corruption among us generates wide-spread and profound social corruption. How long will it be after men have begun to perjure themselves in politics before they will perjure themselves in witness-bearing? What is to restrain men who sell their votes from selling their testimony in our courts of justice? What is to hinder the legislator who suffers himself to be bribed from employing bribery to secure the acquittal of the guilty, and the condemnation of the innocent? The breach of public trusts naturally leads to the breach of private trusts, and thus the very foundations of social morality are subverted. Hence that laxity of commercial morals, those defalcations, embezzlements, swindling in business, and the like, which, as it seems, were never so rife in this country as during the present generation.

But, perhaps, it might be possible for us to live through all this, if it were not for another consequence of our state-secularization, or governmental neutrality in religion, which is of still deeper and more far-reaching significance, namely, the influence which it exerts upon our vast and all-moulding system of public education. For, inasmuch as all our public schools are strictly governmental institutions, organized and maintained under constitutions from which all religious character and objects have been rigorously excluded, this character and these objects, including

all religious worship, instruction and influence, must, if the principle is to be logically realized, be banished from the schools themselves. Even the reading of the Bible, although in some of the states the school-laws do ordain that it shall not be prohibited, is in palpable conflict with the religious neutrality of the organic law. Hence, already, it has been almost universally discontinued. And it is one of the fundamental laws of this department of our state governments, that "no religious test shall ever be required of the teachers of our public schools; and no teacher shall be deemed unqualified for giving instruction in them on account of his opinions in matters of religious belief." Also, one of the most eminent of American jurists has officially decided that "it is no part of the object of our public school system to give religious instruction." How, indeed, could he honestly interpret otherwise the organic law, or meet the objections which are made against such instruction? For it is now the constitutional right of the Roman catholic to object against the use of the Protestant version of the Scriptures in these schools, of the Jew against the New Testament, and of the heathen and infidel against them all. As the matter now stands, every one who chooses can say with overwhelming force of argument, you have no right or constitutional authority to tax me for the instruction of my own or other people's children in a religion in which I do not believe. They have the logic of the case all their own way. If, therefore, this principle be not limited by some other of equal validity and fruitfulness, it will certainly drive out of our schools the Bible, prayer, and every vestige of religious worship and influence, together with the teaching of all morality which rests upon, and is peculiar to the Christian religion. This is its inevitable logical consequence, and, already, in great measure, the actual result.

Now, what must be the effect of this extrusion of religion and Christian morality from our public schools upon

our national character, and upon education itself, is nothing less than appalling to contemplate. For there are three great ends or objects of education, namely, the communication of the most important information, the training or discipline of the mind, and the formation of a right character, and these three are one; that is to say, all sound education is necessarily an organic process, in which each of these objects is a means to the attainment of both the others. For the communication of the most important information, which, of course, is just that which pertains to the moral and spiritual world, is one of the most effectual means of imparting strength and steadiness to the intellectual faculties; whilst these two, the knowledge of the moral and spiritual world, and strength of intellect, are fundamental elements of a right character. In the words of a great poet,

> Stupidity is seldom soundly honest.

By such knowledge, with its proper discipline, the mind is fed, nourished and invigorated, as the body by its appropriate food and healthful exercise. Ignorance is famine and starvation to the mind. If that which is communicated in education be of trivial importance, the mind is dwarfed, as the body by insufficient nourishment. If the relations between the facts and truths communicated be not exhibited, and moral obligations be not impressed, the mind is surfeited, as the body by overloading the stomach and neglect of exercise. If, in tracing out these relations, unsound processes be followed, and immoral tendencies be not corrected, the mind is warped and distorted, as the body by unnatural exercises and contortions. If that be given in education for fact or truth which is neither, the mind is poisoned, as the body by unwholesome food. It is only when the matter of education is fact and truth of the deepest significance, in other words, such revelations

of the moral and spiritual world as are contained in the word of God, and when the child is carefully trained to conform himself to their sacred obligations, that the mind is adequately nourished, strengthened and broadly developed, and attains to its full growth—to the maturity of all its faculties and powers. For the human intellect, in distinction from that of mere animals, is grafted in, so to speak, upon a moral and spiritual root, that is, upon an infinite or exhaustless stock, by which supported and replenished, it is rendered capable of indefinite growth and progress. Hence it is indispensable that it should be trained with constant reference to moral truth, in order that it should put forth its highest blossoms, and bear its golden fruit of true wisdom. And, for this object, nothing can be substituted for the truths of Divine revelation. For, to interest the minds and hearts of children at the dawning of their intellectual and moral life; to acquaint them with what is most necessary to be known for their welfare in this world and that which is to come; to instruct them in the most profound and infallibly correct processes of reasoning; to imbue their minds with the knowledge of the most important history, the noblest eloquence, the most inspiring poetry; to quicken in the highest degree their perceptions of the true, the beautiful, and the good; to inform their minds with sound principles of right and justice; to purify and fix their affections upon the most exalted objects; to strengthen and confirm their wills in resistance to their temptations; to enable them ever to choose aright between good and evil; to make of our sons men, and of our daughters women, in the noblest sense of these words; to transfigure, ennoble and glorify their whole humanity—for the accomplishment of these sublime objects, the Holy Scripture alone is adequate, and therefore indispensable, both as matter of instruction and principle of education.

What an immeasurable evil, then, must result from the

exclusion of the Bible and religious instruction from our public schools! Nor is it possible to provide a sufficient remedy in private academies. For our great public school system is an almost irresistible power to mould the prevailing ideas of education, so that the views which govern it extend to all classes of society and to the whole people. Religious instruction and influence, banished from it, must soon cease to form any part of school education in the community at large. Accordingly, we see that the loss of this idea is working a revolution in this whole department, and, especially, in the character of those who are engaged in it. For the system, being deprived of religious and moral character and objects, naturally attracts as teachers a class of persons who themselves are without religious aims or objects, who have as little religious character as possible, and who, consequently, are unconscientious, unscrupulous people. Such teachers are easily tempted, by the desire to flatter both parents and children, to pass hastily over that elementary knowledge and training upon which all future progress depends, and to increase the number of studies beyond all rational limits—crowding one upon another in such reckless confusion that education, in any true sense of the word, becomes impossible. Hence it is already one of the most difficult things to find a school where a boy can be placed with any reasonable hope that he will obtain such a knowledge of the ancient languages as will enable him to read the classics in after life with any facility, pleasure or profit. And the same abortive results are equally apparent in other branches of education. For, by this overcrowding of studies, children of the brightest intellects are soon discouraged. It is only when they are thoroughly instructed in elementary knowledge, and are enabled to master what they pass over, so as to keep it light behind them, that they can be deeply interested in their studies, so as to face without shrinking the darkness which lies before. When it becomes dark behind as well as before, they become

confused and disgusted, and their intellectual faculties, instead of being educated, are enfeebled and stupefied. This evil is already enormous, and no less in private than in public education, and it is one of the greatest calamities that can befall any people. Hence the general outcry which we hear from parents and guardians: "What shall we do with our children? For, send them where we will, they do not learn, and we cannot prevail upon our boys to go to college." This, in fact, is one of the chief causes of the relative decline in the number of our youth who aspire to collegiate and the higher forms of education, namely, that, in the lower departments, they have no genial interest awakened in their studies, but become disgusted with their blind and fruitless toil.

The influence of this whole system of education divorced from religion and morality is already but too apparent in that early loss of the simplicity and innocence of childhood, in that precocious development of subtlety and forbidden knowledge, which are now so common—in that disgusting manishness which dwarfs the stature, enfeebles the intellect, and, like the worm in the fruits that ripen too early, causes the premature decay and death of so many of our American youth. For some one has bitterly said: 'There are no children in America—they are all pigmy men and women —and half of them never grow up.' How, indeed, should the humanity in them attain to its full growth and stature when they are deprived of that religious and moral instruction in education which is its most necessary food?

This mortal evil extends even to the fundamental relation between parents and children. For a certain religious character, dignity and influence formerly belonged to the father of a family; a certain prophetic, priestly and kingly authority was vested in the head of the household, in virtue of which he felt obliged to assert for himself, and for the mother of his children, a divine right to their reverence and obedience, and to set apart some portion of

the week for their instruction in their relations and duties to God, and to their "superiors, inferiors and equals." How little of all this remains among us now? How, indeed, could it remain after it had ceased to be a self-evident truth, that education is essentially a religious and moral discipline?

In the course of a few generations, the influence of this secularized education must extend to the whole population, and recast in its own likeness our national character, merging its originally deep and moral earnestness in a sort of French levity and frivolity, which, indeed, are already but too common. For there is no less of truth than of wit in the saying, that 'good Americans, when they die, go to Paris.' Rapidly are we becoming more and more assimilated to Parisians. For, of all the influences which go to determine what our national character shall be, the greatest, it may safely be affirmed, is that of our vast system of governmental education. As are the public schools of this land, such will be the governing masses of the people. If they are Christian, the people will be Christian. If the Bible and religion be driven from them, we shall become a nation of sceptics and infidels, with such morality as they can give us.

These are some of the extreme consequences, logically derived, already extensively realized, and in full course of realization up to the present hour, from the principle of individual liberty, taken in its widest sense. This is the course we are now steering with full sails. Is it not evident that, if we continue to pursue it, we must soon find ourselves in perilous waters? And when the mast-head watch shall utter his thrilling cry, 'Breakers ahead, and close under the lee-bow,' there will be no room to 'wear ship'—we must 'go about'—a sudden and violent change of course will be our only and doubtful possibility of escape from disastrous shipwreck. If the principle by which we are now guided and impelled be not limited, and

its extreme consequences arrested by some other historic principle of equal validity and fruitfulness, a sudden and violent reaction against it is inevitable in no long time; and the longer this is delayed, the greater the lengths to which the now dominant idea shall run, the more sudden and the more violent must this reaction be, and the greater must be the evils of the opposite extreme, into which the American mind is as sure to run as that it cannot escape from under the laws which have governed all preceding history. There is no other way to conserve and perpetuate the innumerable and priceless blessings which we owe to the principle but by faithfully applying these limitations before it shall be too late.

Now, therefore, we must enquire, what is that other principle of historical development, no less true and valid, no less evident, and no less fruitful, than the preceding, by which it can and ought and must be limited and restrained from rushing to these and even greater extremes? We answer, it is that of NATIONAL LIBERTY, which involves NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY and THE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS CHARACTER OF NATIONAL LIFE. It remains to develop this idea.

Let us observe, then, that what we call a nation is not to be conceived of as a mere aggregate of individuals, a bare collection or collocation of human beings, having only external relations to each other. A nation is properly an organism, with a unity of life—a life distinct from that of all other nations, and identical in all the individuals of which it is composed. Such an organism is a tree, which, though capable of being grafted with buds and branches from other trees, has yet a distinct life of its own, which is one and the same in all its individual parts. Another such organism is the human body, with its unity of life. National life must needs be a unity, else it could not be life at all, for life is essentially one. As the vital force in the body of a man is one and not many, so that, if you wound

the hands or feet, it is felt in the head, and, if you kill the head, the hands and feet also die, so every body politic has a distinct life of its own, which is not many but numerically one and the same in all its members. Hence it is that nations, to a certain extent, follow the analogy of individuals in the phenomena of infancy, childhood, youth, maturity, decline, old age, decay and dissolution.

This oneness of national life, as we see in the preceding analogy, does not wholly depend upon unity of race, or of immediate genealogical descent: 'For God hath made of one blood [or one life, "for the blood is the life"] all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.' Hence, in other combinations than those of the same tribe descended from a common ancestor, men are capable of being constituted into new organisms or states, which soon become as conscious of their own separate unity and identity as if they were derived from the same particular branch of the great family of man. In such cases, however, there must be one predominant race, speaking one language, to which the individuals of other races are as grafts upon the principal stock, by which both the grafted and native branches are supported and nourished, and whose fulness of ethnic life is such as to absorb and assimilate all the heterogeneous elements. Of all this we, as a people, afford a striking example; for there is no people whose national life is more unique, or whose distinctive character is more sharply defined, than our own. The word, American, as thus applied, is altogether as precise in signification as French, or Spanish, or English, and far more so than German. Our nation, though composed of almost all the heterogeneous varieties of mankind, whilst yet in its infancy, manifests such fulness and strength of its peculiar life that, as a vast galvanic battery, it easily disintegrates, assimilates and Americanizes those dense masses of alien populations which, like the ocean waves that bear them, are incessantly rolling in upon us, and

which lose all separate form and identity in breaking upon our shores.

This distinctive unity of each nation is fully recognized in the exercise of their sovereign powers, and in all their dealings one with another. For sovereignty resides in the nation alone, as distinguished from the individuals of which it is composed. It is a pernicious fallacy to speak of American citizens as sovereigns. Individual sovereignty is anarchy; whilst that of the nation manifests itself in enacting and causing to be executed its paramount laws, from which there is no appeal, in the coining of money and regulating the currency, in making war and peace, and in other similar exercises of supreme power, all which it absolutely prohibits to individuals. In like manner, a declaration of war, or a treaty of peace, between any two nations, binds every individual in both, without regard to their approval or disapproval of the measure. By all such sovereign acts of the nation as such, in which no distinction is or can be made between individuals, it recognizes itself, and is recognized by other nations, as a unit, as a public person, and as responsible to none but God.

Nor is it less evident that God, in His word and by His providence, regards and deals with nations as distinct moral beings, and holds them responsible to himself, than that they so regard and treat each other. For He represents himself as their Creator, no less than of individuals. Men do not create them otherwise than as His instruments, and as the materials out of which they are made. All mankind together are not able to create a blade of grass, nor a particle of matter; how much less that highest and most complex of all the forms of organic life which we call a nation? Creative power belongs to God alone. He is not only the Creator, but is also the Preserver of nations, and holds their lives in His hands, no less than in the case of individuals: "He . . . hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation. . . He is the

Governor among the nations... The blessed and only Potentate, the Kings of kings and Lord of lords... The kingdoms of the world are ... the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ... The government [of them] is upon His shoulder. ... Upon His head are many crowns... Why do the nations rage, and the peoples imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against His Anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision... Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little." Such are some of the representations which God has given us in His word of the moral character and responsibility of nations, as such, and of His government over them.

Consequently, national governments, of whatsoever form, derive and hold their authority and all their powers immediately from God: "For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God." Civil government is "the ordinance of God." The civil magistrate "is the minister of God," and, hence, "he beareth not the sword in vain." And here we have another instance of the pernicious fallacy, that government derives its powers from the people; for this is not true of any one of them. Its form only, not its essence nor its powers, is from the people. It is their function to determine the form of their government, and what powers God vests in it. They have no more authority to take from, or to add to these than they have to increase or diminish the authority and powers of His church. For the church and the state are equally Divine and co-ordinate institutions. God is no less the head of the one than the other, and both alike are responsible to Him, and to Him alone. Hence, nations have a

moral character, of which, and of their conduct, He takes account in His moral government of the world. He deals with them in His providence by rewards and punishments. With blessings and prosperity He seeks to quicken the national gratitude and obedience; with chastisement and afflictions He calls to national humiliation, repentance and reformation. And here, as before, in the distribution of such rewards and punishments, He makes no distinction between the more or less innocent and guilty, just as nations themselves, in dealing with each other, make no such distinctions. In times of peace, health and plenty, these blessings are not confined to the good; nor are the wicked alone cut off by war, pestilence and famine. Thus it is evident that nations, as such, have a moral and religious character and responsibility to God—relations and duties to the God of nations and Supreme Ruler of the world, no less than individuals themselves.

What, then, is the moral and religious character of our nation? And the only answer that can be given is, that we are not a pagan, nor a Mohammedan, nor an infidel, but truly and properly a Christian nation. To this, however, it is objected, that our national constitution does not acknowledge the Christian religion, nor even the being of God. But this is true only of the document or charter in which the powers and duties of our national organization and government are imperfectly defined and prescribed. Besides this, and underlying it, there is what has been called the vital constitution of the nation, in a sense analogous to that in which we speak of the constitution of a man. Now the charter is, of course, intended to describe and set forth this vital constitution; but, as all things human are imperfect and liable to error, it is necessarily imperfect in this respect, just as no written paper could exhibit in absolute perfection the constitution of a human being; and its imperfection is acknowledged by the nation itself, in that it is made subject to amendment as its defects be-

come apparent. But what ought to be regarded as its greatest defect is, that it does not recognize the moral, religious and Christian character of the nation, nor define the rights, powers and moral obligations which are inseparable from it. This remarkable omission is to be explained, however, not by any conscious hostility to the Christian religion, but, as we have seen, by the extreme development of the principle of individual liberty, from which it had come to be generally held, that civil government could not have any religious character or object, but must be completely secularized. It was in this way that all the Christian elements of our vital constitution as a nation were left out of our written constitution; and, in order to restore these, and thus to perfect its form, it requires to be amended by the same authority by which it was originally adopted and enacted. For we must ever bear in mind that the adoption of our constitution did not make us a nation, but we, as a nation, made and adopted our constitution.

The elements of our vital constitution as a Christian nation are such as the following: 1. The emigrants from the old world who originated our national existence were eminently a Christian people. It was chiefly a religious impulse which landed them on this continent. They were driven from their country and wealth, their kindred, homes and churches by religious persecution; and they sought in these western wilds a refuge for their persecuted faith, where they might worship God according to their own consciences, and might educate their children in the truths of the gospel of Christ. They brought with them hardly anything but their religion. Such were the founders, not only of our nation, but also of our national character. 2. A vast preponderance in numbers of the inhabitants of our national domain are Christians in this sense, that they are not heathens, nor Mohammedans, nor infidels, but either true or speculative believers in Christianity, or, at

least, in sympathy with its character and objects. Hence they carry with them into all their new settlements, as a sacred palladium, or rather as the ark of their national covenant and safety, the word of God, the preaching of the gospel, and the Christian church. In the same sense, the public opinion of the country is Christian. 3. All our great national institutions and all our best social customs are founded in, and draw their nourishment and support from the Christian religion. These are such as our free government, free thought, free speech, free press, free schools, free Bible, and free church, in all their local ramifications and territorial expansion. For where, beyond the pale of Christianity, is there any such freedom? Where else, indeed, but in a Christian country are such institutions and customs possible, or even conceivable? 4. In fine, the common law of the land, on which all our statutes of justice and equity are founded, and under which, directly or indirectly, all our judicial verdicts and decisions of our courts are rendered, is the law of Christian morality, as distinguished from the morality of other religions. And here we have a point where religion and politics are self-evidently inseparably blended together, and where the complete secularization of government is manifestly impossible. For the morality which is peculiar to some religion must, of necessity, be the common law of every country; and these moralities are very different from each other. Pagan morality allows and often justifies infanticide, polygamy, polyandria, the burning of widows, and a thousand similar abominations. Mohammedan and Mormon morality justifies and encourages polygamy and private vengeance. All these are prohibited by our laws and punished as crimes for no other reason but because the common law of the land is that of Christian morality. Such are the chief elements of our Christian constitution and character as a nation, from which it is sufficiently evident that the complete secularization of the state, the absolute divorce

of politics from morality and religion, is impossible, and only a vain dream of extreme theorists.

Here we would gladly arrest this argument, without any discrimination between "those who profess and call themselves Christians," but the plain truth of the case carries us further. For we are no less a Protestant than we are a Christian nation. All our civil and religious liberties, all our free institutions, our morality, and our civilization itself, are the outbirth and development of Protestant Christianity. Nor is the truth of this even limited by the fact, that Romanism is found among us; for it is nothing properly American, but an exotic, purely a foreign growth, not yet assimilated, that is to say, Americanized. The members of that communion are mostly foreign born. Its head, whom both priests and people are sworn to obey in all things spiritual and temporal, claims to be a foreign prince, with full power to absolve his subjects from their allegiance to other governments under which they live—a power which he has often actually exercised. Whilst they remain his subjects, they cannot, in good faith, enter into and constitute any part of our American nationality. As they become Americanized, they cease to be Romanists—a process which is constantly going on. For in spite of the perfection of their organization, and all they can do to prevent it, incredible numbers of their children born in this country escape from under their control. Thus, as we learn from the statistics of the Propaganda at Rome, they have already lost one half of their numbers; that is to say, if all the emigrants with their children had remained in their communion, they would have been twice as numerous in this country as they are now. Their church itself, under Protestant influence, is evidently undergoing a great transformation, especially in the purification of its corrupt morality. For they can no more escape from the all-transforming influence of our American institutions and customs—our free government, free thought, free press and

universal education—than they can escape from the influences of the climate. They are fast being grafted into the stock of our Protestant nationality, and the life which circulates in all their veins and thoughts is a Protestant life, which ensures that, in becoming Americans, they must cease to be Romanists.

Since, then, we are, indeed, a Christian and a Protestant nation; since the nation is a rational and moral creature of God who has made us what we are, and who is the source of all our blessings; and since all our national institutions and blessings, yea, even our civilization itself, are the fruits of Protestant Christianity;—all this surely must involve a national responsibility, which cannot be conceived of as requiring anything less than some public and legal acknowledgement of the being and providence of God, of our dependence upon Him, and of our subjection to His moral laws. It cannot be otherwise but that it is our bounden duty to recognize and honor, in our most significant national and governmental acts, the source from which, and the channel through which, all our blessings have been derived to us. It is our bounden duty, as a nation, no less than as families and as individuals, to honor and worship our God and Creator. For no intelligent and moral creature can with impunity refuse or decline, for any reason whatsoever, thus to worship and honor its Creator. As the individual and the family, so the nation must thus bring upon itself His sovereign displeasure and a grievous punishment. For it is a violation of the moral constitution and order of nature when the child, for any reason, or to gain any object, refuses to own its parentage.

Also, moral responsibility implies moral freedom. Whatsoever we, as a nation, are morally bound to do, that we are of right free to do. And here we must bear in mind that there are two classes of rights and liberties which require to be guarded with perpetual vigilance, that they may not unduly encroach upon each other. The first

is that of the individual, which, pushed to its utmost extreme, results, as we have seen, is anarchy. The other is that of society, whether civil or ecclesiastical, which, in extreme development, absorbs that of the individual. In one of these extremes the pope and the autocrat of Russia sit upon their desolate and hollow thrones; and we lose what ought to be dearer to us than life, that is, our nation's liberty and right to worship God, whilst we rush to the other. For where we now stand, this inalienable right of the nation is absorbed and nullified by the encroachments of individual liberty. The golden mean is ever the path of safety. If, then, we are a Christian and a Protestant nation, in the name of the people, in the name of the truth, in the name of God, we are free and have the right to say so in our constitutions, laws, and other governmental and national acts. It is our inalienable right to acknowledge, worship and honor our God as a free Christian and Protestant nation. And we are obliged to vindicate this right at all hazards. For to yield it up is to renounce our national parentage, birthright and character; it is to repudiate our national religion and our dependence upon God, in whom our fathers trusted; it is to betray ourselves blindfolded and manacled, as our children will find to their sorrow, in the very citadel of our religious liberties.

But, it will be asked, does not all this imply some form of Erastianism, or, at least, some modified union of church and state, which American institutions cannot tolerate? We answer that it implies nothing of the kind. For Erastianism makes the church the creature of the state, as in the writings of Hobbes, the philosopher of Malmsbury, which we hold to be an abomination in the sight of God. And the union of church and state, in any form, necessarily implies, either some sort of state control over the church, as in England, or some sort of church control over the state, according to the papist theory. Now both of these things we cordially repudiate, and that, in the

name of every branch of the Protestant church in this country. The doctrine here advocated is, that the church and the state, as also the family, are all co-ordinate institutions, independent of each other, each supreme within its own sphere, and all alike of divine appointment, having one and the same head and fountain of all their authority and powers in God, whom, consequently, they are all alike obliged by the most solemn obligations to acknowledge, worship and obey. It is as false and wrong for the state to fail in this duty as it is for the family or the church. When the state, for any reason, claims to have no moral character, object, or duties to God, it falls into a gross anomaly, and exemplifies that to which the Psalmist refers in 'kings and rulers taking counsel together to break God's bands asunder, and to cast away His cords from them, at all which He that sits in the heavens laughs and holds them in derision.'

In fine, all that is here contended for would require but a very slight change, and that, in the preamble of our national charter, such as the following: "We, the people of the United States," [claiming to be a Christian and a Protestant nation], "do ordain and establish this constitution." The insertion of that simple clause would bring our national charter into harmony with our vital constitution as a nation, with which it is now in conflict, and would open an unobstructed channel to the true currents of our national life. It would leave all denominations calling themselves Christians whatever liberties they now enjoy to follow their natural developments, and to exert all the influence of which they are capable: it would complicate no question between them, and it would give them all, except the foreign element of Romanism, a great advantage in prosecuting the glorious work in which they are all co-laborers together with the fathers of the reformation, and with all true friends of civil and religious liberty. It would reclaim for us, in our fundamental and

organic law, the inalienable right, which we have so foolishly disclaimed, to worship our fathers' God in our legislative bodies, army and navy, and in our courts of justice; to require an oath in His name of our civil magistrates, and in witness-bearing; to observe, as a nation, and to protect by laws and penalties, our Christian Sabbath; to punish blasphemy, polygamy, adultery and seduction; to inflict the death-penalty for murder; and to make the word of God matter of instruction and principle of education in our all-moulding system of governmental education. It would legitimate all these and other elements of our vital constitution as a Christian nation, which are now illegitimate, and only partially tolerated—as the disjointed fragments and debris of a former system of ideas, that of a Christian state, held so sacred by our forefathers who established our institutions—and which, in the ultimate development of the now dominant principle, must inevitably disappear altogether. Nor could it fail to exert a powerful influence to purify our political life by restoring to it moral and religious character, objects and aims. For never did Protestants fall into a greater anomaly and blunder than by eliminating such objects from civil government and politics, but for which the reformation itself could never have established itself in the world. If it had not been for the support of Protestant princes and governments, even by long and bloody wars, in which hundreds of thousands sacrificed their lives in defence of the truth, Protestantism must have been strangled at its birth. It originated, maintained its existence, and propagated itself as a political, no less than as a religious principle; and when it denies to civil government all religious and moral character and objects, it commits suicide.

Whatever may be demanded of us in the name of individual religious liberty by infidels, pagans, papists and Mormons, who number only a few in every thousand of

our Christian population—whatever they may demand which is inconsistent with our Christian and Protestant character, as a nation, must be strenuously denied. For if we admit these extreme consequences of the principle, we give the death-blow to our national unity, liberty and responsibility. The nation, as distinguished from the individuals of which it is composed, is deprived of every vestige of religious liberty—is prohibited the exercise of its religion—the very foundation of our free institutions and of our national existence is subverted. The principle of national liberty gives us all the answer we need to these brazen demands, as follows:

Children of the papacy, do we not know you, through all your historical antecedents and the principles which you unblushingly avow, as the sworn enemies of both religious and civil liberty? When did you ever concede either the one or the other where you had the power to withhold or crush it? Who can number the martyrs of both whom you have tortured and slain? Having fled from your own countries, where, crushed to the earth by the despotism of your priests and princes, you had neither liberty nor bread nor hope, you have taken refuge in the protecting arms and fostering bosom of a free Protestant nation. We have received you to liberty, plenty, and a new life, the fruits to us of our Christian and Protestant nationality. And, now, with shameless effrontery, you demand, in the name of religious liberty, as a right of your consciences, that we banish the word and worship of God from all our public schools and national institutions, which, as you yourselves avow through your highest authorities, must inevitably result in making us a nation of infidels. If, indeed, this be the freedom of conscience which only will content you, once for all, you cannot be gratified—set your hearts at rest—and if without this you cannot be contented, we give you permission to return to your own nationalities, and to the Italian priest who is

your temporal prince, of whom you may demand rights and liberties, and see what he will give you.

Enemies of the Christian religion, infidels, by whatsoever particular name you are called, we did not receive our free institutions, nor any of the priceless blessings which distinguish us from all other peoples, from you, but from our God through the channel of His word and the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ. We are a Christian nation, and, as such, we are free and responsible to God. Whatsoever rights, liberties and blessings you can enjoy among us in consistency with this our Christian character, as a nation, are freely yours. We will defend them with our blood as strenuously for you as for ourselves. We will not touch your freedom to worship God, or not, as to you may seem best. If you are willing to incur the responsibility, you may deny that He exists, and we, on our highest authority, will do no more than to regard you as the fool who hath said in his heart, "There is no God." But, now, you demand, in the name of religious liberty, as a right of your consciences, not only that we banish the word and worship of God from our public schools, but also that we abolish all religious exercises in our legislative bodies, army and navy, and all legal protection for our Christian Sabbath; that we refuse to acknowledge God and our Christian nationality in our constitutions and laws; that we thus repudiate the source from which, and the channel through which, we have derived all our national institutions and blessings. This, as you are well aware, would soon bring us to your ground, and make of us a nation of infidels.

To you, also, therefore, we say, that, if this be the liberty of conscience which only will content you, it is time that you should be informed that we also have consciences, which bind us by the most sacred of all obligations to acknowledge and worship our God in our most solemn and significant national acts, and to educate our

children in the glorious truths of the Christian religion. We will defend and maintain our inalienable right to do this, God helping us, against the world in arms. Beware how you touch it. You cannot be gratified in your preposterous demands—set your hearts at rest—and if you cannot be contented, go form a nation and a state for yourselves wherever you can find a place, and see if infidelity will do for you what Christianity has done for us.

If a similar difficulty should arise in a Christian family, how would it be treated? A Christian father has a son who is still a member of his family, but who does not believe in God. He goes to his father, and says: Father, we must abolish family worship. You have no right to insist that we, as a family, shall worship a God in whom I do not believe, and whose existence I deny. For it places me in an unequal and irksome relation to the other members of the household. You may pow-wow in private as much as you please, but I insist that we have nothing of the kind in common. What answer would a good and wise father make to such a demand? Why, he would say, My son, you are unreasonable—you cannot be gratified. I will not limit your individual liberty. I will not require you to attend family prayers. You are now a man, and you must judge for yourself on your own responsibility. But if you take the ground that this Christian family shall not acknowledge nor worship God, because you, as an individual, do not believe in Him, I say to you, with infinite sorrow, my son, there is the door. So we say to all objectors against this inalienable right and most sacred duty of our nation to acknowledge and worship God. And such answer the great palpitating heart of the nation now gives—it needs only to be interpreted and justified to the intellect of the people, which we have here attempted to do. We hear it in the throes of our great cities, whose governments are clutched by obscene harpies, who lay waste the property of the citizens, whilst they afford no

protection even to life. We hear it in the muttering of national perplexity over prodigious political corruption. Inarticulate as yet, but full of a vast meaning, like the thunderous tramp of armed squadrons, like the heavings of the earthquake, like the ground-swell of the ocean, is the indignation of a mighty people awaking to the conviction that they have been beguiled by political quackery into the surrender of the most precious liberties and rights of a free Christian and Protestant nation.

In conclusion, we venture to predict that the time is not far distant when some capable man, putting himself at the head of the political movement which is thus making itself obscurely felt, will become the most popular candidate for the chief magistracy of the nation. This great Christian and Protestant people, whose patience has become exhausted by intolerable political corruption, and by the demoralization of its educational interests, will stand by him in his efforts to re-vindicate our national religious liberty. Raising his voice in behalf of the nation's right to worship God, he will speak into clear consciousness their own dim and struggling thoughts, and they will hasten to crown him with their highest honors. For the selfishness and mockery of the age have not been able to quench the sacred flame of patriotism in human hearts; it is the true Promethean fire which cannot be extinguished whilst an honest and brave man, or a virtuous woman, continues to exist. My father land, let me defend and honor thee with my life! My mother country, let sight fail from my eyes and joy from my heart, when I refuse to stand between thee and dishonor! We are lost to all good when our hearts do not thrill with the power of this great mystery. And the Christian religion, the Protestant faith, which has made us what we are for good—by this faith we live, and for this faith we are ready to die. For it is more to us than country and kindred, father and mother, wife and child. We will not betray it. We will

defend and maintain, on all occasions and against all opponents, our inalienable liberty and right to avow ourselves, in our constitutions and laws, in our governmental and national acts, a free Christian and Protestant nation. And the ages to come will rise up and call us blessed, the preservers, as we now bless the authors, of our civil and religious liberties.

THE BEGINNINGS OF HISTORY

According to the Bible and the Traditions of the Oriental Peoples. From the Creation of Man to the Deluge. By FRANCOIS LENORMANT, Professor of Archœology at the National Library of France, etc. (Translated from the Second French Edition). With an introduction by FRANCIS BROWN, Associate Professor in Biblical Philology, Union Theological Seminary.

1 Vol., 12mo, 600 pages, - - - $2.50.

"What should we see in the first chapters of Genesis?" writes M. Lenormant in his preface—"A revealed narrative, or a human tradition, gathered up for preservation by inspired writers as the oldest memory of their race? This is the problem which I have been led to examine by comparing the narrative of the Bible with those which were current among the civilized peoples of most ancient origin by which Israel was surrounded, and from the midst of which it came."

The book is not more erudite than it is absorbing in its interest. It has had an immense influence upon contemporary thought; and has approached its task with an unusual mingling of the reverent and the scientific spirit.

"That the 'Oriental Peoples' had legends on the Creation, the Fall of Man, the Deluge, and other primitive events, there is no denying. Nor is there any need of denying it, as this admirable volume shows. Mr. Lenormant is not only a believer in revelation, but a devout confessor of what came by Moses; as well as of what came by Christ. In this explanation of Chaldean, Babylonian, Assyrian and Phenician tradition, he discloses a prodigality of thought and skill allied to great variety of pursuit, and diligent manipulation of what he has secured. He 'spoils the Egyptians' by boldly using for Christian purposes materials, which, if left unused, might be turned against the credibility of the Mosaic records.

"From the mass of tradition here examined it would seem that if these ancient legends have a common basis of truth, the first part of Genesis stands more generally related to the religious history of mankind, than if it is taken primarily as one account, by one man, to one people. . . . . While not claiming for the author the setting forth of the absolute truth, nor the drawing from what he has set forth the soundest conclusions, we can assure our readers of a diminishing fear of learned unbelief after the perusal of this work."—*The New Englander.*

"With reference to the book as a whole it may be said: (1) That nowhere else can one obtain the mass of information upon this subject in so convenient a form; (2). That the investigation is conducted in a truly scientific manner, and with an eminently Christian spirit; (3). That the results, though very different from those in common acceptance, contain much that is interesting and to say the least, plausible; (4). That the author while he seems in a number of cases to be injudicious in his statements and conclusions, has done work in investigation and in working out details that will be of service to all, whether general readers or specialists."—*The Hebrew Student.*

"The work is one that deserves to be studied by all students of ancient history, and in particular by ministers of the Gospel, whose office requires them to interpret the Scriptures, and who ought not to be ignorant of the latest and most interesting contribution of science to the elucidation to the sacred volume."—*New York Tribune.*

*** *For Sale by all booksellers, or sent, post-paid, upon receipt of price,*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, PUBLISHERS,
743 AND 745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

OUTLINES OF PRIMITIVE BELIEF

among the Indo-European Races.

By CHARLES FRANCIS KEARY, M.A.,
of the British Museum.

One vol. crown 8vo., - - - - ***$2.50.***

Mr. Keary's Book is not simply a series of essays in comparative mythology, it is a history of the legendary beliefs of the Indo-European races drawn from their language and literature. Mr. Keary has no pet theory to establish; he proceeds in the spirit of the inquirer after truth simply, and his book is a rare example of patient research and unbiased opinion in a most fascinating field of exploration.

"We have an important and singularly interesting contribution to our knowledge of pre-historic creeds in the *Outlines of pre-historic Belief among the Indo-European Races*, by Mr. C. F. Keary, of the British Museum. No contemporary essayist in the field of comparative mythology—and we do not except Max Müller—has known how to embellish and illumine a work of scientific aims and solid worth with so much imaginative power and literary charm. There are chapters in this volume that are as persuasive as a paper of Matthew Arnold's, as delightful as a poem. The author is not only a trained inquirer but he presents the fruits of his research with the skill and felicity of an artist."—*New York Sun.*

"Mr. Keary, having unusual advantages in the British Museum for studying comparative philology, has gone through all the authorities concerning Hindoo, Greek, early Norse, modern European, and other forms of faith in their early stages, and there has never before been so thorough and so captivating an exposition of them as that given in this book."—*Philadelphia Bulletin.*

THE DAWN OF HISTORY.

AN INTRODUCTION TO PRE-HISTORIC STUDY.

Edited by C. F. KEARY, M.A.,
OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

One Volume, 12mo., - - - $1.25.

This work treats successively of the earliest traces of man in the remains discovered in caves or elsewhere in different parts of Europe; of language, its growth, and the story it tells of the pre-historic users of it; of the races of mankind, early social life, the religions, mythologies, and folk-tales of mankind, and of the history of writing. A list of authorities is appended, and an index has been prepared specially for this edition.

"The book may be heartily recommended as probably the most satisfactory summary of the subject that there is."—*Nation.*

"A fascinating manual, without a vestige of the dullness usually charged against scientific works. . . . In its way, the work is a model of what a popular scientific work should be; it is readable, it is easily understood, and its style is simple, yet dignified, avoiding equally the affection of the nursery and of the laboratory."—
Boston Sat. Eve. Gazette.

*** *For sale by all booksellers, or sent, post-paid, upon receipt of price, by*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, PUBLISHERS,
743 AND 745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

The Religions of the Ancient World

Including Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia, Persia, India, Phœnicia, Etruria, Greece, Rome.

By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A.

One Volume, 12mo, - - - - $1.00.

Uniform with "The Origin of Nations."

Canon Rawlinson's great learning and his frequent contributions to the history of ancient nations qualify him to treat the subject of this volume with a breadth of view and accuracy of knowledge that few other writers can lay claim to. The treatise is not intended to give an exhaustive review of ancient religions, but to enable the students of history to form a more accurate apprehension of the inner life of the ancient world.

"The historical studies which have elevated this author's works to the highest position have made him familiar with those beliefs which once directed the world's thought; and he has done literature no better service than in this little volume. . . . The book is, then, to be accepted as a sketch, and as the most trustworthy sketch in our language, of the religions discussed."—*N. Y. Christian Advocate.*

THE ORIGIN OF NATIONS

By Professor GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A.

One Volume, 12mo. With maps, - - $1.00.

The first part of this book, Early Civilizations, discusses the antiquity of civilization in Egypt and the other early nations of the East. The second part, Ethnic Affinities in the Ancient World, is an examination of the ethnology of Genesis, showing its accordance with the latest results of modern ethnographical science.

"An attractive volume, which is well worthy of the careful consideration of every reader."—*Observer.*

"A work of genuine scholarly excellence and a useful offset to a great deal of the superficial current literature on such subjects."

—*Congregationalist.*

"Dr. Rawlinson brings to this discussion long and patient research, a vast knowledge and intimate acquaintance with what has been written on both sides of the question."—*Brooklyn Union-Argus.*

*** *For Sale by all booksellers, or sent, post-paid, upon receipt of price, by*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, PUBLISHERS,

743 AND 745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

The Theory of Preaching,

OR

LECTURES ON HOMILETICS.

By Professor **AUSTIN PHELPS, D.D.**

One volume, 8vo, - - - - - $2.50

This work, now offered to the public, is the growth of more than thirty years' practical experience in teaching. While primarily designed for professional readers, it will be found to contain much that will be of interest to thoughtful laymen. The writings of a master of style of broad and catholic mind are always fascinating; in the present case the wealth of appropriate and pointed illustration renders this doubly the case.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

"In the range of Protestant homiletical literature, we venture to affirm that its equal cannot be found for a conscientious, scholarly, and exhaustive treatment of the theory and practice of preaching. * * * To the treatment of his subject Dr. Phelps brings such qualifications as very few men now living possess. His is one of those delicate and sensitive natures which are instinctively critical, and yet full of what Matthew Arnold happily calls sweet reasonableness. * * * To this characteristic graciousness of nature Dr. Phelps adds a style which is preëminently adapted to his special work. It is nervous, epigrammatic, and racy."—*The Examiner and Chronicle.*

"It is a wise, spirited, practical and devout treatise upon a topic of the utmost consequence to pastors and people alike, and to the salvation of mankind. It is elaborate but not redundant, rich in the fruits of experience, yet thoroughly timely and current, and it easily takes the very first rank among volumes of its class.—*The Congregationalist.*

"The layman will find it delightful reading, and ministers of all denominations and of all degrees of experience will rejoice in it as a veritable mine of wisdom."—*New York Christian Advocate.*

"The volume is to be commended to young men as a superb example of the art in which it aims to instruct them."—*The Independent.*

"The reading of it is a mental tonic. The preacher cannot but feel often his heart burning within him under its influence. We could wish it might be in the hands of every theological student and of every pastor."—*The Watchman.*

"Thirty-one years of experience as a professor of homiletics in a leading American Theological Seminary by a man of genius, learning and power, are condensed into this valuable volume."—*Christian Intelligencer.*

"Our professional readers will make a great mistake if they suppose this volume is simply a heavy, monotonous discussion, chiefly adapted to the class-room. It is a delightful volume for general reading."—*Boston Zion's Herald.*

*** *For sale by all booksellers, or sent, post-paid, upon receipt of price, by*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, PUBLISHERS,
743 AND 745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Men and Books;

OR, STUDIES IN HOMILETICS.

Lectures Introductory to the "THEORY OF PREACHING."

By Professor **AUSTIN PHELPS, D.D.**

One Volume. Crown 8vo. - - $2.00

Professor Phelps' second volume of lectures is more popular and general in its application than "The Theory of Preaching." It is devoted to a discussion of the sources of culture and power in the profession of the pulpit, its power to absorb and appropriate to its own uses the world of real life in the present, and the world of the past, as it lives in books.

There is but little in the volume that is not just as valuable to all students looking forward to a learned profession as to theological students, and the charm of the style and the lofty tone of the book make it difficult to lay it down when it is once taken up.

"It is a book obviously free from all padding. It is a *live* book, animated as well as sound and instructive, in which conventionalities are brushed aside, and the author goes straight to the marrow of the subject. No minister can read it without being waked up to a higher conception of the possibilities of his calling."

—*Professor George P. Fisher.*

"It is one of the most helpful books in the interests of self-culture that has ever been written. While specially intended for young clergymen, it is almost equally well adapted for students in all the liberal professions."—*Standard of the Cross.*

"We are sure that no minister or candidate for the ministry can read it without profit. It is a tonic for one's mind to read a book so laden with thought and suggestion, and written in a style so fresh, strong and bracing."—*Boston Watchman.*

"Viewed in this light, for their orderly and wise and rich suggestiveness, these lectures of Professor Phelps are of simply incomparable merit. Every page is crowded with observations and suggestions of striking pertinence and force, and of that kind of wisdom which touches the roots of a matter. Should one begin to make quotations illustrative of this remark, there would be no end of them. While the book is meant specially for the preacher, so rich is it in sage remark, in acute discernment, in penetrating observation of how men are most apt to be influenced, and what are the most telling qualities in the various forms of literary expression, it must become a favorite treatise with the best minds in all the other professions. The author is, in a very high sense of the term, an artist, as for a quarter of a century he has been one of the most skillful instructors of young men in that which is the noblest of all the arts."—*Chicago Advance.*

*** *For sale by all booksellers, or sent, post-paid, upon receipt of price, by*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, PUBLISHERS,

743 AND 745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Old Faiths in New Light

BY

NEWMAN SMYTH,

Author of "The Religious Feeling."

One Volume, 12mo, cloth, - - - $1.50.

This work aims to meet a growing need by gathering materials of faith which have been quarried by many specialists in their own departments of Biblical study and scientific research, and by endeavoring to put these results of recent scholarship together according to one leading idea in a modern construction of old faith. Mr. Smyth's book is remarkable no less for its learning and wide acquaintance with prevailing modes of thought, than for its fairness and judicial spirit.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

"The author is logical and therefore clear. He also is master of a singularly attractive literary style. Few writers, whose books come under our eye, succeed in treating metaphysical and philosophical themes in a manner at once so forcible and so interesting. We speak strongly about this book, because we think it exceptionally valuable. It is just such a book as ought to be in the hands of all intelligent men and women who have received an education sufficient to enable them to read intelligently about such subjects as are discussed herein, and the number of such persons is very much larger than some people think."—*Congregationalist.*

"We have before had occasion to notice the force and elegance of this writer, and his new book shows scholarship even more advanced. * * * When we say, with some knowledge of how much is undertaken by the saying, that there is probably no book of moderate compass which combines in greater degree clearness of style with profundity of subject and of reasoning, we fulfil simple duty to an author whose success is all the more marked and gratifying from the multitude of kindred attempts with which we have been flooded from all sorts of pens."—*Presbyterian.*

"The book impresses us as clear, cogent and helpful, as vigorous in style as it is honest in purpose, and calculated to render valuable service in showing that religion and science are not antagonists but allies, and that both lead up toward the one God. We fancy that a good many readers of this volume will entertain toward the author a feeling of sincere personal gratitude."—*Boston Journal.*

"On the whole, we do not know of a book which may better be commended to thoughtful persons whose minds have been unsettled by objections of modern thought. It will be found a wholesome work for every minister in the land to read."
—*Examiner and Chronicle.*

"It is a long time since we have met with an abler or fresher theological treatise than *Old Faiths in New Light*, by Newman Smyth, an author who in his work on "The Religious Feeling" has already shown ability as an expounder of Christian doctrine."—*Independent.*

*** *For sale by all booksellers, or sent postpaid, upon receipt of price, by*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,
NOS. 743 AND 745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

The

Conflict of Christianity

WITH HEATHENISM.

By DR. GERHARD UHLHORN.

TRANSLATED BY

PROF. EGBERT C. SMYTH and REV. C. J. H. ROPES.

One Volume, Crown 8vo, $2.50.

This volume describes with extraordinary vividness and spirit the religious and moral condition of the Pagan world, the rise and spread of Christianity, its conflict with heathenism, and its final victory. There is no work that portrays the heroic age of the ancient church with equal spirit, elegance, and incisive power. The author has made thorough and independent study both of the early Christian literature and also of the contemporary records of classic heathenism.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

"It is easy to see why this volume is so highly esteemed. It is systematic, thorough, and concise. But its power is in the wide mental vision and well-balanced imagination of the author, which enable him to reconstruct the scenes of ancient history. An exceptional clearness and force mark his style."—*Boston Advertiser.*

"One might read many books without obtaining more than a fraction of the profitable information here conveyed; and he might search a long time before finding one which would so thoroughly fix his attention and command his interest."—*Phil. S. S. Times.*

"Dr. Uhlhorn has described the great conflict with the power of a master. His style is strong and attractive, his descriptions vivid and graphic, his illustrations highly colored, and his presentation of the subject earnest and effective."—*Providence Journal.*

"The work is marked for its broad humanitarian views, its learning, and the wide discretion in selecting from the great field the points of deepest interest."—*Chicago Inter-Ocean.*

"This is one of those clear, strong, thorough-going books which are a scholar's delight."—*Hartford Religious Herald.*

*** *For sale by all booksellers, or sent post-paid upon receipt of price, by*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

Nos. 743 and 745 Broadway, New York.

AUTHORIZED AMERICAN EDITION.

CHRISTIAN INSTITUTIONS:

Essays on Ecclesiastical Subjects.

By A. P. STANLEY, D.D.,
Late Dean of Westminster.

One vol., crown 8vo, Library Edition, $2.50; Student's Edition, 75c.

The work includes chapters upon Baptism, the Eucharist, the Eucharist in the Early Church, Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Real Presence, the Body and Blood of Christ, Absolution, Ecclesiastical Vestments, Basilicas, the Pope, the Litany, and the Belief of the Early Christians.

"They have all an antiquarian, historical, and practical interest, and are treated in a very liberal and very attractive style. Dean Stanley is a genius as well as a scholar, and has a rare power of word painting. His *History of the Jewish Church* and of the *Eastern Church* are as interesting and entertaining as a novel. He always seizes on the most salient points, and gives them an artistic finish. He avoids all pedantry of learning, and all tedious details."—*Dr. Schaff in The Critic.*

"No scholar of taste, no lover of the historic art, no fine antiquarian will read these essays without grateful emotions and manifold profit."—*Boston Advertiser.*

DEAN STANLEY'S OTHER WORKS.

The History of the Jewish Church. With maps and plans.
Vol. I. From Abraham to Samuel.
Vol. II. From Samuel to the Captivity.
Vol. III. From the Captivity to the Christian Era.
Each 1 vol., crown, 8vo., per vol., $2.50.

Westminster Edition of the History of the Jewish Church. Handsomely printed on superfine paper, and tastefully bound. Three vols, 8vo. (Sold in sets only.) $9.00.

The History of the Church of Scotland. 8vo, $1.50.

The History of the Eastern Church. With an Introduction on the study of Ecclesiastical History. Crown 8vo, $2.50.

Westminster Sermons. Sermons on special occasions preached in Westminster Abbey. 1 vol., 8vo, $2.50.

The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D., late Head Master at Rugby School. 2 vols in one. Crown 8vo, $2.50.

*** *For Sale by all booksellers, or sent, post-paid, upon receipt of price, by*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, PUBLISHERS,
743 AND 745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

DATE DUE

APR [illegible]			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01010 3150